

Copyright free



Librarian

**Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library
Govt. of West Bengal**

Recent Trends in Indian Nationalism

A. R. DESAI



POPULAR PRAKASHAN, BOMBAY

A. R. DESAI

First published 1946
Second edition, 1973
(3047)

PRINTED BY S. M. BALSAR, AT USHA OFFSET PRINTERS PVT. LTD., NATIONAL
HOUSE, TULLOCH ROAD, BOMBAY 400 001 AND PUBLISHED BY RAMDAS C. BHATKAL
FOR POPULAR PRAKASHAN PVT. LTD. 35C TARDEO ROAD, BOMBAY 400 034.

**To
THE MEMORY OF
MY FATHER**

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

"Recent Trends in Indian Nationalism" is being reprinted. The book was out of print for some years. Preoccupations with University work and involvement in other researches and publications prevented me from revising the book and making it up-to-date. However, the pressure of the Publisher, to meet the growing demand for this work, compelled me to reprint the work in its original form.

The book, as indicated in the preface of the first edition, was a sketch delineating the broad trends emerging in India after Independence. The method adopted to analyse the reality of social transformation was the method of Historical Materialism. I also indicated in my studies of Indian Nationalism viz. "Social Background of Indian Nationalism" and "Recent Trends in Indian Nationalism" that this powerful method enables one to discover long term tendencies. It provides greater insights into the unfoldment of the core processes of social development, than any other method. It is proving its superiority over other methods is Social Studies. This is proved by the fact that hundreds of "scattered studies towards factual surveys based on 'Organic metaphysics of liberal practicality'" have avoided the central problems of "historical structure" and have transformed social studies into conscious or unconscious provider of apologetic for Ruling Class policies.

I am attempting to examine the unfolding Indian social reality on the explicit assumption of adopting the method of Historical Materialism. The major postulate adopted in the earlier edition of the book was stated clearly. *The Indian Society after Independence is being shaped on Capitalist path of development. The State which has emerged in India after Independence is a capitalist state. The Constitution evolved is bourgeois Constitution and the leadership, is representing Capitalist class and is reshaping the economy and society on Capitalist path. The slogan of socialistic pattern is a hoax to create illusion and confuse the masses. The real intentions and practices are geared to the development on Capitalist*

lines. The book also pointed out how the trends of development, economic, political, social, educational and cultural, emerging after Independence could be understood and explained only if they are viewed as a result of a policy of Capitalist path of development in Indian context. It also pointed out that the direction of emerging trends, the growing contradictions and the evolving tensions and antagonisms have arisen out of the social transformation on Capitalist path.

Through a series of papers, articles and books, I am attempting to point out how this approach is being vindicated by developments in various segments of Indian social reality.

The central thrust of the 1st edition has been more than proved by the subsequent developments. The emergence of the leadership of Smt. Indira Gandhi, with her sloganary of Garibi-Hatao, Socialism, and concern for weaker section, does not disprove the central proposition of the argument of the book.

Prof. Gunnar Myrdal in his major classic "Asian Drama" has given a clarion call to scholars to explicitly state the major postulates on which they conduct their studies. He has chastised the Western scholarship for its so-called value-free researches. Prof. C. Wright Mills in his "Sociological Imagination" also launched a scathing attack on the scholarship based on "Organic Metaphysics of liberal practicality" as indicated in the preface to our First Edition of the present book. I also pointed out in the first edition that the Indian scholarship is also basically affected by the disease of "Social Science of Scattered Milieus".

It is my submission that studies of Indian social development, while providing some valuable information have not only failed to grapple with but have even dodged the central issues. As formulated in this book, I deem it urgent that social scientists clearly realise that the transformation that is being brought about in India is on Capitalist Path, and that the State that has emerged in India after Independence, is a Capitalist State whether government is headed by Pt. Nehru, Shastri, Morarjee Desai, Indira Gandhi, Bajpai or even S. A. Dange or Jyoti Basu. It is also necessary to clearly understand that the policies, followed by the Government, whatever their variations from time to time, have one consistent axis viz. a

policy to adumbrate Capitalist socio-economic formation.

Explicit recognition of this crucial point alone will enable the scholars to arrive at a proper comprehension of the trends of development that are taking place in India² and also to grasp the nature of tensions and antagonisms unfolding in the country.

I do hope the reprint of the present work will help to reassert the central point presented in the earlier edition, which to my mind has become even more relevant today. The coming into power of Smt. Indira Gandhi, with her slogans of Garibi-Hatao and Socialism, has switched a large section of Indian scholarly fraternity to evolve a radical stance and sophisticated terminology to interpret the astute Capitalist policies of Smt. Indira Government, as socialist ones. Unless the major postulates are not clearly comprehended, there is a danger, that the bulk of Indian scholarly fraternity unconsciously or consciously will be used as band-wagons or prize fighters to defend the policies of the Smt. Indira Government as socialists while in reality they are adroitly elaborated to evolve Capitalist path of development, with all its implications for exploited and oppressed classes of India.

I am deeply thankful to Sjt. Ramdas Bhatkal and his able associate Sjt. Gokarn for forcing me to reprint the book and publishing it in its present elegant form. I trust the book, will evoke further discussion on the central issues of vital significance for Indian society.

A. R. DESAI

Jaykutir,
Taikalwadi Road,
Bombay-16.
6-3-1973

PREFACE

"RECENT TRENDS IN INDIAN NATIONALISM" attempts to continue the discussion on the theme of Indian Nationalism during the War and Post-War period, and is a brief extension of my earlier study, "Social Background of Indian Nationalism".

When I was retouching "Social Background of Indian Nationalism" for its third Edition, the Publishers asked me to add a few pages in the form of a Post-script delineating the development of Indian Nationalism during the War and Post-War period. I struggled hard to work out a short Postscript. However, due to the exigency of adequately portraying the numerous momentous developments which took place during this period, and vastly transformed world social landscape, the Postscript lengthened to the size of a small book. It was deemed advisable to publish this elaborate Postscript as a separate companion volume to "Social Background of Indian Nationalism". The present work is thus in the nature of an enlarged Postscript of "Social Background of Indian Nationalism".

I have been trying to study the phenomenon of Indian Nationalism in its recent socio-historical context for a number of years. Massive literature has been accumulating dealing with different aspects of Indian development and that too on the rich background of a rapidly changing international setting. I desire to present the picture that has been emerging in greater detail and substantiate it by a large volume of evidence subsequently in a more comprehensive study—an elaborate sequel to "Social Background of Indian Nationalism".

In the process of my study, I found to my painful surprise that there has been hardly any attempt made hitherto to cohesively depict the developments—apparently confusing and contradictory—that have taken place during last twenty years.

There is a tragic dearth of literature which is prompted by bold hypotheses and, further, which transcends mere pragmatic, empirical and symptom-describing level. Some of the attempts to evaluate the total development suffer from lack of a scientific approach, and have been made from the standpoint of such misleading theories as the creative genius of the Hindus or the Great Man theory. A large number of works is in the nature of defence

credo of the extant Government and avoid some of the most vital questions of Indian social development. Social development in India is made to appear as a Jigsaw puzzle.

It appears that our dominant economic thought, political theorizing, historical analysis as well as sociological and philosophical exploration have, after independence, taken to expedient apologetics in place of scientific inquiry. They appear to have been adapted to the needs of the ruling class rather than prompted by anguished search for objective truth. As one great scientist has very pertinently pointed out, "What Social Science needs is less use of elaborate techniques and more courage to tackle, rather than dodge, the central issues."

The scholarly literature on various aspects of the social-cultural life of India seems hesitant to confront central issues, is inclined more to dodge the crucial-epochal problems that face Indian society.

C. Wright Mills, in his recent profound work "Sociological Imagination" has pointed out the pitfalls of recent social science studies. According to him,

If there is any one line of orientation historically implicit in American Social Science, surely it is the bias toward scattered studies, toward factual surveys, and the accompanying dogma of a pluralist confusion of causes. These are essential features of liberal practicality as a style of social study. For if everything is caused by innumerable "factors" then we had best be careful in any practical actions we undertake.

We must deal with many details, and so it is advisable to proceed to reform this little piece and see what happens, before we reform that little piece too. And surely we had better not be dogmatic and set forth too large a plan of action. We must enter the all-interacting flux with a tolerant awareness that we may not yet know, and perhaps will never know, all the multiple causes at work. As social scientists of milieux, we must become aware of many little causes; to act intelligently, as practical men, we must be piecemeal reformers of milieux, one here and one there.

Walk carefully.... things are not so simple. If we break a society into tiny 'factors', naturally we shall then need quite a few of them to account for something and we can never be sure that we have hold of them all. A mere emphasis upon "the organic whole" plus a failure to consider the adequate causes—which are usually structural—plus a compulsion to examine only one situation at a time—such ideas do make it difficult to understand the *structure of the status quo*....

In the "Organic" metaphysics of liberal practicality, whatever tends to harmonious balance is likely to be stressed. In viewing everything as a "continuous process" sudden changes of pace and revolutionary

dislocations—so characteristic of our time—are missed, or if not missed, merely taken as signs of the 'pathological', the 'maladjusted'. The formality and assumed unity implied.... decrease the possibility of seeing what a modern social structure may be all about. (pp. 85-86).

Indian scholarship is also being affected by the disease of "social science of scattered milieus". It is also becoming a prisoner of "'organic' Metaphysics of Liberal practicality". It is also elaborating a screen to avoid observing "sudden changes of pace and revolutionary dislocations" or treat them as "pathological" phenomena. It also basically avoids the central problems of "historical social structures".

Professor Mills has rightly pointed out that any significant major study of a social phenomena needs to answer the following crucial questions:

- "(1) What is the structure of this particular society as a whole? What are the essential components and how are they related to one another? How does it differ from other varieties of social order? Within it, what is the meaning of any particular feature for its continuance and for its change?
- "(2) Where does this society stand in human history? What are the mechanics by which it is changing? What is its place within and its meaning for the humanity as a whole? How does any particular feature we are examining affect and how is it affected by, the historical period in which it moves? And this period—what are its essential features? How does it differ from other periods? What are its characteristic ways of history making?"

The present work is an endeavour to understand the recent trends in Indian Nationalism. It tries to answer some of the outstanding questions with regard to Indian society from a synthetic perspective. It is based on the application of the method of Historical Materialism. It, for the first time, tries to indicate the casual connections underlying economic, political, social, educational, cultural, and ideological currents that have been developing in India. To my best knowledge, this is the first synthetic account of the various aspects of Nationalism in India, that have developed during the War and Post-War period.

The present study is in the nature of a *draft for examination*. It also is in the nature of a challenge to provoke controversy over many fundamental problems of Indian history.

The author will be happy and will be fully rewarded if the present work stimulates more comprehensive and more scientific

analyses of this most significant and fateful phase of Indian history. In fact, the present work is intended to focus attention on the extremely complex and unprecedented problems confronting the Indian nation the adequate understanding and mutual relationships of which alone can help to comprehend the law of motion of the Indian Society as a whole during the present historical period.

I am deeply grateful to Dr. G. S. Ghurye who has constantly goaded me to pursue the exploration of the more fundamental problems of social life.

I extend my thanks to Dr. Dharendra Narain in helping me to get this work through the press. I am also thankful to the Librarian of the Bombay University and his courteous staff. To the publishers, I cannot but extend my thanks. But for their persistence this work would not have seen the light of the day.

The author will feel amply compensated if like his earlier work "Social Background of Indian Nationalism", this work also evokes controversies and stimulates healthy discussion on the subject.

Bombay

A. R. DESAI

Department of Sociology

University of Bombay

Bombay 1

26th January 1960

C O N T E N T S

Preface to the Second edition	vii
Preface	xi
SECTION I—WAR AND POST-WAR PERIOD	1
A. CYCLONIC TEMPO OF HISTORY:	
Dynamics of World Development—Second World War—Character of War—Cost of War—Far-reaching Consequences of World War II.	
B. CHANGED SOCIAL LANDSCAPE:	
Emergence of the U.S.A. colossus—American Imperialism as guardian of World Capitalism—Decline of Britain and France—Nature of Conflicts among Imperialist Powers—Strategy of Imperialist Powers—Colonial World during Post-War Period—Categories—Problems before the ruling classes of new Independent Countries—Trends of development in Underdeveloped Independent Countries—Emergence of the Socialist Bloc—Its significance—Bureaucratic Deformities—Major Tensions in Socialist Countries—China's Unique Features—Future Trends in Soviet Bloc—Function of Communist Parties outside the Socialist Countries—Contemporary World Scene.	
C. U.N.O. ITS ROLE:	21
Role of International Organizations—N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and other power coalitions—Future Perspective.	
SECTION II—NATIONALISM IN INDIA DURING THE WAR PERIOD:	
A. OUR PROGNOSIS	25
B. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS:	28
Classic opportunity for Indian Bourgeoisie; The British Economic Policy—Reckless Profiteering—Changing position of British and Indian Capitalists—New Era of fusion of Indian and foreign capital.	
C. POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS:	33
India arbitrarily made participant in War—N. Congress and British Government—Individual Civil Disobedience—New Situation in War—	

Cripps Mission to India—The famous August Revolution of 1942—Strategy—Political Statement—Growing Political and Economic discontent at the end of the War—R.I.N. Mutiny—Sir Strafford Cripps on new line of Imperialism—Cabinet Mission—Growing rift between I. N. Congress and Muslim League—Mountbatten Plan and Partition of India.

D. IMPLICATIONS OF PARTITION:	45
SECTION III—NATIONALISM AFTER INDEPENDENCE:	
A. A GREAT PARADOX:	47
Party of Unity vivisepts India—Political Enigma—Some crucial questions before Historians—Stormy Controversy—Major fallacies of Historians—Historical Position of Indian Bourgeoisie.	
B. TRANSFER OF POWER, A CONSTITUTIONAL DEVICE, NOT A PRODUCT OF POLITICAL REVOLUTION: ..	54
Transfer of Power, a Constitutional Device, its Implications.	
C. EMERGENCE OF A BOURGEOIS WELFARE STATE: ..	56
Main features of the State structure of Independent India—A Bourgeois State—Significance of emphasising the class character of the State—Professor Laski's Profound observations—A Bourgeois Welfare State—Two Alternatives—Lesson of Contemporary History—Actual functions of the Bourgeois Welfare State—Basic Problems confronting the Congress Government.	
D. POLITICAL TRENDS:	64
Political Tasks—Absorption of Feudal States: Strategy and causes of its success—Undesirable features of the Strategy and its consequences—Rama Rajya without Rama—Thorny problems of Nationalities—Empirical approach of the Congress—Foreign Pockets—Problems of Administrations—Greater rigidity and increasing curtailment of democratic freedoms—Foreign Policy—Panchshila.	
E. HISTORIC CHOICE—CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM? ..	73
Economic Policy of Congress—Significant Problems—Economic Dilemma before Congress—Policy of Mixed Economy—Two Conceptions of	

Planning—Public Sector, a matter of necessity for the capitalist class—Bourgeois Precursors of Five Year Plans.

F.	ECONOMIC TRENDS:	81
	Industrial Policy of the Congress Government—Planning assists Indian Bourgeoisie—Eminent Economists on Profits of Capitalists—Economic rulers of Indian People—Economic Oligarchs and Nepotism, Corruption—Closer Understanding between State and the Private Sector—Conflicting views among Bourgeoisie—Agrarian Policy of the Congress Government—Government measures—Repercussions of the Measures—Professor Gadgil on the 'Core of Agrarian Reform'—Critique of Land Reforms—Facilities taken advantage of by substantial farmers—Village organizations controlled by richer section—alarming trends—New patterns of tensions and collisions—General Economic Policy of the Government—Double drain on country's resources—Democratic Planning?—Economic Dilemma—Desperate hunt for foreign capital—Sharp controversy among two wings of Bourgeoisie—Professor Ball's thoughtful observations.	
G.	CONSTITUTION OF INDIAN REPUBLIC:	102
	Its Socio-cultural significance—Juridical repudiation of Hierarchic Past—Formidable Problems before Congress Government—Equality and Acquisitive Society—No Secular Civil Code.	
H.	TRENDS IN EDUCATION:	107
	Major defects of Education during British Period—Educational tasks confronting Congress Government—Absence of rational plan in education—Education still a Cinderella—Dilemma in the field of education—Growing appetite for education—Sorry state of education—Pragmatic and contradictory educational policies.	
I.	SOCIAL TRENDS:	115
	Bourgeois Industrialisation vs. Socialist Industrialization—The Congress Government chooses Capitalist Industrialization for India—Bourgeois Industrialisation—Its Limitations—Social trends in	

Urban areas—Growing disparity between expanding industries and insufficient civic amenities—Upper-class cultural configuration—Disorganization of family, breakdown of morality and increase of crime and prostitution—Mobility degenerates into shiftlessness—Social trends in rural areas—Agrarian area a battle-field of competing groups—Accentuation of caste conflicts in new competitive set-up—Whither Lower Strata—Weak organization of Lower Strata on class lines—New rural elite—Myron Weiner's Pregnant observations—A new and deeper social crisis.

J.	IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS:
	Idealist and Religio-Revivalist Trends—Some Manifestations.			
K.	POLITICAL PARTIES
L.	THE CENTRAL IDEA
	BIBLIOGRAPHY
	INDEX

SECTION ONE

WAR AND POST-WAR PERIOD

SECTION I

WAR AND POST-WAR PERIOD

A

CYCLONIC TEMPO OF HISTORY

DYNAMICS OF WORLD DEVELOPMENT

THE years of intra-war and post-war period have been crowded with momentous events. Decades of history have been compressed in the history of the years of this period. The economic basis and the political and social superstructure of the societies of a number of countries have experienced sharp changes and, in some instances, even transformations. The social world of man has become a theatre of a multitude of accentuated contradictions, sharpened antagonisms and resultant intensified conflicts between nations, classes and social systems. A global war threatens humanity with atomic devastation and even total extinction. Side by side with this, however, historically progressive social forces are also triumphantly advancing scoring victories and guaranteeing to save humanity from a suicidal catastrophe.¹

History has been moving at a cyclonic tempo since the outbreak of the Second World War. The Indian people, too, have been drawn in the orbit of this historical tide. They have travelled through great social, economic and political changes during this period.

Since the theme of our work is recent trends in Indian Nationalism (and not a history of India), we will briefly study its dynamics and the vicissitudes it has experienced during the intra-War and post-War periods. We will survey the changes in the relations of various classes and socio-economic groups comprising the Indian Nation, the changes in their relative strengths and their mutual struggles. We will also discuss how far the basic democratic tasks of Indian Nationalism such as national emancipation, termination of Imperialist economic exploitation, the creation of an indepen-

1. Refer numerous publications of U.N.O. and UNESCO

dent and balanced national economy, the liquidation of the feudal and zamindari relations, the solution of the problems of nationalities and national minorities, civil liberties and others have been accomplished.

The history of Indian Nationalism, as surveyed in the earlier work *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*", has been the history of the struggles of the various social classes constituting the Indian Nation such as the national bourgeoisie, the proletariat, the peasantry (peasant-proprietors, tenants and land labourers), urban and rural middle-classes and ruined artisans and handicraftsmen, feudal princes, semi-feudal landlords and others as well as of the interaction of the Indian Nation with other nations of the world. The historical resultant of those struggles and interactions provide movement to Indian society at a given moment.

Before we locate and assess the significant developments in Indian society during the War and post-War period from the standpoint of further evolution of the Indian Nationalism, it is essential to survey and evaluate the world developments during that period. This is because the Indian society is an integral part of the world society, a part which interacts with other societies and feels the impact of those societies on it as well as exerts influence on them too. The historical movement of Indian society is the product not only of the interplay of internal social forces but also of the forces of the international world and their impact on Indian society.

For a scientific understanding of Indian development, it is vitally necessary to survey and study the world development during the intra-war and post-war periods since Indian development has been taking place within the matrix of world development.

SECOND WORLD WAR

The Second World War was the product of an amalgm of inter-imperialist antagonisms on one hand and the antagonism between Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union on the other. It was a mixed war, a war between two coalitions of imperialist states (Britain, France, the U.S.A. and others vs. the three Axis Powers viz. Germany, Italy and Japan) on one hand and one of these coalitions of imperialist states (Axis Powers) and the Soviet Union on the other. It happened that one coalition of the belligerent imperialist states was composed of anti-democratic fascist imperialist states and the other formed of democratic imperialist states.

The fundamental cause of the antagonism between the fascist and democratic groups of imperialist states lay in the fact that the former group needed expansion as a result of the necessity of their capitalist economies, needed to have colonies where the surplus products of their industries could find monopoly or near-monopoly markets and which could also serve as reservoirs of raw materials for those industries and, further, serve as spheres of investment of surplus capital which could not be profitably invested at home. At that given moment, a substantial part of the global economic territory was controlled or owned by other rival imperialist powers viz. Britain, France, Holland, the U.S.A. and others. This was the genetic cause of the antagonism which led to war among the two coalitions of the above-mentioned imperialist states. The cause was fundamentally economic and explained the aggressive behaviour of the Fascist-Imperialist states.

When the democratic imperialist states—Britain, France, the U.S.A. and others—defended themselves against the aggression of the fascist states, they were basically defending their already existing privileged position in the world economy, their substantial control and possession of the major portion of the economic territory of the world, their colonies. While Britain, France, Holland and other states were owners of empires, the U.S.A., though not a colonial power, had due to its formidable economic strength been establishing increasing economic domination over the world.

The war between these two coalitions of imperialist states was, therefore, an imperialist war, a war for the violent seizure of colonies and economic territory held by one coalition and for forcible retention of these by the other.

There was another feature distinguishing the one coalition from the other. It lay in the fact that the form of state in Germany, Italy and Japan was anti-democratic and fascist while that in Britain, France, the U.S.A. and other associated countries, democratic.

Hence while democratic imperialist states, when they defended themselves against the assault of Fascist-Imperialist states, were also defending incidentally the democratic form of their states and general democratic liberties in their lands (however, curtailed, crippled, distorted and counterfeit due to the prevalence of capitalist social relations) against the would-be conquerors, viz. Fascist-Imperialist states.

This fact helped these states to camouflage their war aim as

one of 'defence of democracy' though their basic objective was to retain their predatory hold over colonies challenged by the fascist invaders.

CHARACTER OF WAR

The war between these two coalitions of states was a war between 'Have-nots' and 'Haves', between those who had subjugated in the past and were exploiting numerous colonial peoples and those who did not possess colonies but schemed to expropriate those who possessed them.

The 'defence of democracy' as the declared aim of democratic imperialist states was only a masquerade to disguise their real aim of retaining their colonial possessions (in economic or political sense) against their violent seizure from fascist imperialists. It is proved by the fact that these states during the war period did not voluntarily concede democratic freedom to their colonial subject peoples, did not willingly liquidate their empires, did not of their own accord give up their economic exploitation of backward peoples.

There is nothing inherently peace-engendering or anti-war-like in democratic imperialism. In fact democratic imperialist states have warred among themselves in the past for the hegemony of the world and, mainly through wars, built their colonial empires.

It was only an accident that during the war, one group of belligerent imperialist states happened to be democratic, the other fascist. It was not this secondary difference that brought them into collision. The basic cause of the war was the inexorable economic need of German capitalism for expansion, for conquest, for the violent seizure of large areas as its economic territory. The war will and the war programme of the Nazi state were the subjective expression of the need of expansion of German monopoly capitalism. So with the capitalisms of Italy and Japan also.

Nazi Germany, the leader of the Axis powers, planned to implement its need for predatory expansion, not only at the expense of democratic imperialist powers but also at the expense of the Soviet Union. When Nazi Germany invaded the latter, it was a war of fascist imperialist intervention. The Soviet Union was not defending, in the war against Nazi Germany, any colonial empire since it did not possess any. The Second World War, in this case, was a war of pure self-defence on the part of the Soviet

Union, however one may approve or disapprove of its pact with Nazi Germany before the invasion.

It may be noted here that the wars of the colonial peoples against all imperialist powers, fascist or democratic alike, as well as the wars of the peoples of the European countries against the foreign fascists after the latter had occupied and enslaved their countries, were democratic wars, wars of national emancipation.

COST OF THE WAR

It is not necessary for our purpose to follow the progress of the war during its various phases. After initial victories of alarming dimensions the fascist powers suffered a decisive defeat. Japanese imperialism, the armed forces of which had advanced up to the frontiers of India, was finally defeated and sued for peace immediately after the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The armies of Nazi Germany which victoriously marched as far as Stalingrad and Moscow were stopped there and rolled back up to Berlin by the Red Armies. Fascist Italy, too, sustained a final defeat and capitulated.

Thus the three fascist imperialist powers were eliminated.

World War II proved more devastating and destructive than World War I. According to authoritative estimates while World War I claimed about 30 million dead and mutilated and cost about £ 35,000 million, World War II was responsible for about 41 million killed only (both military and civilian casualties) and cost £ 223,000 million.²

FAR-REACHING CONSEQUENCES OF WORLD WAR II

The consequences of World War II were momentous and far-reaching. The political physiognomy of the world was considerably altered. The relations and relative strengths of nations, classes and different social systems experienced profound changes. A number of powerful states either disappeared in the limbo of history or lost their previous formidable strength. New property relations ousted old ones in a number of countries (countries of East Europe, China) in varying degrees. Old classes bound up with old forms of property vanished with the supercession of old

2. Refer R.P. Dutt: *The Crisis of Britain and British Empire*

property forms. New anti-capitalist states came into being in East European countries like Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Yugoslavia and East Germany, which set as their objective the establishment of a socialist society and which, in pursuance of that objective, in varying degrees, abolished feudal and capitalist forms of property and, thus, eliminated classes bound up with those forms of property. As a result of these changes, the political and economic territory of world capitalism further contracted resulting in intensified struggles among capitalist groups over the diminished world market and sources of raw materials. History, further, presented the spectacle of the emergence of the colossus of a single capitalist power, the U.S.A., which has been increasingly dominating almost all other capitalist powers, some of them ancient and with traditions of world eminence like Britain and France, in the economic and, hence, also in the political sphere.

The process of the transformation of the world picture does not stop there. Mighty national liberation movements with scope and militancy exceeding those of such movements in the pre-World War II period broke out in a number of colonial countries compelling ruling imperialist powers to concede political independence to them (India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos, Indonesia and others).

Further, the new and hitherto unawakened nations of Africa and other continents have been for the first time drawn in the orbit of national liberation movements.

The urge for freedom and equality has never reached such heights before as in the intra-war and post-war periods.

B

CHANGED SOCIAL LANDSCAPE

The world picture has been so tremendously transformed in this period that it requires a great mental effort to realize fully the magnitude and depth of the transformation. This is because man living in the social world, which exists on a global scale in the present epoch, is himself inescapably caught in the torrent of events of world historical significance, in the whirlpool of history agitated as never before. To have a full comprehension of the fateful significance of the pregnant events which have broken out during recent years, one requires to step out of the socio-historical pro-

cess by means of a subjective acrobatic and visualize it in all its rich complexity, rapid dynamic and kaleidoscopic diversity.

Briefly put, the following are the principal features of the changed social landscape of the world during this period:

1. Changed positions of various imperialist powers.
2. Emergence of new independent national states out of old colonial subject countries and their problems and struggles.
3. Emergence of a number of non-capitalist states in Eastern Europe and China and their interrelations among themselves and relations with the Soviet Union.
4. Dynamic interrelationships between all these categories of countries providing the basic theme of the great drama of social life today.

EMERGENCE OF THE U.S.A. COLOSSUS

First we will briefly survey the changes in the imperialist world, the changes in the position and strength of the principal imperialist powers, after the end of the Second World War, and the changes in their mutual relations.

As mentioned before, the three powerful imperialist states—Germany, Italy, Japan—were eliminated as independent imperialist powers as a result of their defeat in the War. Germany was even dismembered. But in spite of their victory, other imperialist powers except the U.S.A. emerged from the war economically, politically and militarily considerably weakened. Their empires were in crisis, their financial and economic strength ebbed seriously, and their military power greatly declined.

American Imperialism emerged from the War as the most powerful imperialism in the world in the economic, political as well as the military spheres. It stands today as an unchallenged titan in the capitalist world. "As in the first world war, so in the second world war, the United States intervened once again as the last of the major belligerents to draw the maximum profits in return for minimum burdens . . . other countries were devastated, overrun or blitzed. The United States was immune. Other countries emerged economically and financially impoverished and weakened. The American monopolists made gargantuan profits, totalling according to official records, 52 billion dollars or £ 13,000 million after taxation. They increased the productive power of their plant by one half and accumulated capital reserves of 85

billion dollars or £ 21,250 million. This vast expansion of accumulated capital and productive power sought outlet after the war and led to the drive for American world expansion which has been so marked a characteristic of the post-war years."³

Since the end of the war, American capitalism, which, as a result of the rapid growth of its productive capacity and accumulation of capital, requires larger and larger economic territory, is penetrating not only Asiatic, African and other colonies of the older imperialisms but also imperialist countries themselves, including even Britain and France. American finance capital has been invading colonies, semi-colonies and under-developed new countries and is increasingly dislodging other imperialisms in the trading and financial spheres.

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AS GUARDIAN OF WORLD CAPITALISM

American Imperialism has been prompted by three principal considerations when it renders economic aid as loans and in other forms to a number of countries both imperialist and colonial. First, it needs an outlet for its surplus product and surplus capital. Secondly, the War had undermined the national capitalist economies of a number of countries (including Britain and France) to the point of collapse. The collapse would have resulted in the cessation of production processes which would have threatened social revolutions in these countries. These social revolutions could only be socialist or communist revolutions in the era of declining capitalism. American imperialist capitalism could hardly be expected to greet such a perspective and consummation. As the only solvent and powerful capitalism in the contemporary epoch it assumed the role of the guardian of the world capitalist system. It went to the rescue of the bankrupt and derelict capitalisms of Britain, France and other countries and rendered decisive aid through Marshall and other plans to them thereby saving them from collapse in the post-war period.

As John Gunther, the eminent author remarks: "It is my honest belief that if American aid were withdrawn from Greece the Greek Government could not survive ten days. Nor could the Governments of France and Italy survive more than a few weeks or months."⁴

3. Ibid., pp. 121-122

4. *New York Herald Tribune*, February 3, 1949

Thirdly, American capitalism gives economic and other aid to a number of countries for strategic reasons also. It is to protect capitalism against the oncoming tide of socialist revolutions, to prevent the national and colonial revolutions which have been breaking out with great frequency from further developing, and, again, to create a chain of strategic anti-communist bases encircling the socialist countries, bases to be used in the event of a war with them. It itself is also making formidable preparations for a war with the Soviet Union. With its stupendous economic resources, the U.S.A. has built up a powerful military machine. It is spending about a hundred times the sum which it was spending on armaments in the pre-war period. Assuming the role of the guardian of the world capitalist system it has been establishing numerous military, naval and air bases all over the world. In a number of cases it is making such a condition precedent (either overtly or covertly) to the granting of economic aid to other countries. It also directly supplies armaments to some countries for strengthening them as military bases. The capitalist governments of these countries, partly due to their own fear of socialist and communist revolutions in their own countries and partly due to the pressure of the U.S.A., have been not only increasing their armaments but also consenting to the proposal of the U.S.A. to permit it to establish such bases in their own countries. The growing threat of a new world war between the capitalist world and the socialist world led by the Soviet Union is prompting them to agree to such proposals of the U.S.A. The Nato, the Seato, the Baghdad and other pacts indicate this trend.

One significant consequence of the dependence of Britain and other countries on the U.S.A. has been the strengthening of the latter's position in the U.N.O. The U.S.A. exerts pressure on the states economically dependent on it and gathers their support for its policies. It threatens to withhold assistance and thereby secures their political votes in the U.N.O. Though relatively strong states like Britain may, on occasions, resist this pressure, they have generally to take into account the fact of their economic and strategic dependence on the U.S.A.

DECLINE OF BRITAIN AND FRANCE

Britain and France, though victorious in the war, emerged with their economic and military strength considerably weakened. They

became dependent on the American titan for financial help to renovate their shattered economies, resulting in their political subordination to the latter also.

This however does not signify that the inter-imperialist contradictions have been eliminated. Rooted in the very competitive character of the capitalist economy, these contradictions continue to function but within the framework of the fundamental unity of all imperialist powers, now become more necessary due to the threat of the extending and deepening colonial revolutions, the sharpening socialist class struggles in the metropolitan countries, and also due to the increased strength of the socialist world which now envelopes one third of the world.

NATURE OF CONFLICTS AMONG IMPERIALIST POWERS

The inter-imperialist conflict, however, moves strictly within the limit of the unity of all imperialist powers confronted by a common danger.

The inter-imperialist conflict has expressed itself in various domains, political, economic and others. It manifests itself in the world of trade where imperialist rivals struggle over markets, sources of raw materials and zones of capital investment. For instance, American capital has been trying to displace British capital in countries like India and other Asiatic countries, in Canada and Latin American countries, in European and African countries, even in Britain herself. Due to the superior economic strength of the U.S.A., the general tendency is towards the increased aggrandisement of American capital in various parts of the world. Their different and conflicting economic interests often prompted the imperialist powers to adopt conflicting attitudes and policies towards socialist countries like China and others in the political field. Hong-kong is extremely valuable to Britain from the standpoint of trade. Hence in striking contrast to the U.S.A. which has maintained uncompromising opposition to the recognition and admission of the Peoples Republic of China into the U.N.O., Britain has recognised the latter and supports its inclusion in the World Assembly. Different interests of various imperialist powers result into their divergent policies over problems emerging in the international world. For instance, the U.S.A. compelled Anglo-French powers to wind up their military aggression against Egypt over the Suez Question. Inter-imperialist rivalries find expression also in their

conflicting policies in the countries of the Middle East and South-East Asia.

There has also been divergence of views and hence of policies among the imperialist powers regarding the problem of the methods of combating anti-imperialist and socialist forces which are threatening capitalism in various parts of the world. Their different policies regarding this mainly spring from their respective different outlooks determined by their sectional capitalist interests. Thus the U.S.A., Britain and France have their own conceptions as to how to fight the socialist bloc or colonial revolutions.

Each imperialist power tries to displace the other from its control over a country and instead instal itself in that country. For instance, the countries of the Middle East became the arena of such struggles between Britain and the U.S.A. When the awakened Arab nations eliminated the British grip over some of these countries and thus when 'a power-vacuum' was created, the U.S.A. tried to fill up such a vacuum.

STRATEGY OF IMPERIALIST POWERS

The general strategy of the imperialist powers in countries, in which their direct or indirect political domination is slipping away, is to reach compromises with them on the basis of their relinquishing the political grip over them but retaining their economic interests (e.g. safeguarding of British and other foreign capital in India, British-owned oil resources in Iraq and others). Such compromises take numerous politico-economic forms.

The attitude of the imperialist powers to colonial peoples whom they ruled range between two extremes, one provided by French imperialism in Algeria where it is engaged in ruthlessly crushing the national liberation struggle of the Algerian people and the other by Britain which gave independence to India while retaining its invested capital in the country through an agreement.

Generally the imperialist powers, while abandoning their political grip over the colonial countries over which they rule, try to perpetuate their economic and strategic hold over these countries. They also transfer power to the feudal and capitalist classes of these countries relying on them as class allies in the struggle against the socialist countries and world socialist movement. The economic weakness of these classes, generally make them dependent upon and politically servile to the imperialist powers.

COLONIAL WORLD DURING POST-WAR PERIOD

We will now survey the main features of the colonial world composed of undeveloped and under-developed countries during the post-war period.

CATEGORIES

The countries of the colonial world can be divided into two categories: one that of the countries which achieved political independence, the other that of those which are not still independent and are generally engaged in carrying on struggles of national emancipation. There are also newly awakened peoples of many countries of Africa, Latin America and also other continents which have been, for the first time, drawn into the orbit of large-scale anti-imperialist colonial revolutions.

Further some of the countries which achieved independence have taken to the road of development on socialist lines (China, North Korea, Viet Nam and others) while the others have been advancing on the road of capitalist or state capitalist development.

Also some of these countries (India, Ceylon, Burma, Egypt, Pakistan and others) won independence as a result of the new strategy of the ruling imperialism viz. that of giving up its political hold over those countries and transference of power to the indigenous bourgeois classes but on the basis of an agreement safeguarding its capital invested in those countries.

But in countries like China, the indirect imperialist domination and the indigenous puppet government were eliminated by means of an armed struggle of the people led by the Communist Party.

PROBLEMS BEFORE THE RULING CLASSES OF NEW INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES

The ruling capitalist classes of the new independent countries have been endeavouring to build prosperous capitalist economies in their countries. Since these economies have been backward due to their free development having been obstructed by imperialism and, further, existing in the phase of declining world capitalism, the ruling capitalist classes have been confronted with formidable difficulties. They have to rely substantially on foreign financial

aid in the form of capital, capital goods and technicians. The main features of their economic policy are state planning, partial nationalisation and launching of new state-owned enterprises since private capital is too weak, and by imposing heavy economic burdens on the mass of the people in the form of heavy taxation, deficit financing and others. Due to the insuperable difficulties inherent in the historical situation, the national private and state-capitalist economies of these countries have been developing inharmoniously, through periodic ebbs, truncatedly and, above all, on the basis of the increasingly declining standards of the people, thus resulting in the shrinkage of indigenous market. Foreign market is extremely limited, is even shrinking for these countries due to intensified rivalry among competitors.

In spite of the adoption of a number of agrarian reforms by the bourgeois governments, the agrarian economies of these countries do not show any appreciable progress. This is due to a number of obstacles such as primitive technique, land fragmentation, colossal indebtedness of the peasant population, overpressure on agriculture, survivals of feudal remnants, lack of alternative occupations to ruined artisans and dispossessed agriculturists, uneconomic holdings and others. Polarization of classes has been advancing in all these countries. This is evidenced in the increasing discontent among the lower and middle strata of society and resultant sharpening of class and other social conflicts. The spectre of socialist and communist revolutions is haunting the ruling classes in these countries.

In none of these countries feudal remnants in the national economy, social institutions, and the consciousness of the people have been completely dissolved. Local and regional particularisms, caste and communal divisions—the product of a feudal and colonial past—retard the process of a healthy national advance.

The ruling national bourgeoisies of these countries are endeavouring their best to build up a progressive national economy comprising an independent (through the development of heavy industry) and highly advanced industry and flourishing agriculture on a capitalist basis. But as we have observed in the chapters of the earlier book, in the epoch of the decline of world capitalism, it is not possible to create such a prosperous national economy on a capitalist basis. The productive forces of industry and agriculture of these countries can develop freely and harmoniously only on the basis of socialism (not to be confused with controlled

or state capitalism), on the basis of the social ownership of the means of production and structural planning on a national scale. The political pre-requisite for this is transfer of state power from the vested interests to the working people.

TRENDS OF DEVELOPMENT IN UNDER-DEVELOPED INDEPENDENT COUNTRIES

Before these nations won independence, there emerged and developed a national united front of different classes and social groups to eliminate the foreign domination. Even class struggles moved within the framework of this national united front. But after the nations became free, these class struggles inevitably arising from the class structure of the existing society became sharpened and aggravated. The foreign domination which united various classes in a common front against itself no longer existed. Further, due to the backward character of the capitalist economy the national bourgeoisie has no economic means to buy off the discontent of the people. These backward independent countries have been suffering from the evils of insufficiently developed capitalism as also those of feudal economic and social survivals. These countries have, therefore, become theatres of intensified class struggles. These class struggles have been further reinforced by various types of regional, communal and other sectional struggles.⁵

After the end of the Second World War, due to the heightened tension of the historical situation, two power blocs came into being in the international world viz. the imperialist capitalist bloc headed by the U.S.A. and the socialist bloc headed by the Soviet Union though socialist Yugoslavia remains outside the latter bloc. The new independent countries of the post-war period try to manoeuvre between the two blocs and secure economic, political and strategic aid from both the blocs. However, due to the fact that the capitalist class is in power and shapes foreign policies of those countries, they are afraid of internal revolutionary outbreaks of the masses whom they need to exploit more intensely and, further, because of their decisive economic dependence on aid *liaison* with the imperialist-capitalist bloc, they basically lean towards the latter. As Professor D. R. Gadgil has observed, "Most areas which are today underdeveloped have, in recent past, been under the influ-

5. Refer to U.N.O. and UNESCO publications on social tensions as well as works of Prof. W.M. Ball, Rupert Emerson, Kahin and others

ence, direct or indirect, of the highly developed capitalist countries. Among them there are not instances of rapid economic development."⁶

Another characteristic of the new independent countries is that almost a state of permanent political disequilibrium prevails in varying degrees in those countries. This is due to a number of factors such as a backward economy, phenomenal poverty of the population and resultant almost chronic social and class conflicts, also due to the massive corruption and scandalous inefficiency characterizing the administrative machinery. Further, there also exists an organic corrupt *liaison* of private capital and state machinery at varying levels poisoning the entire moral climate. The capitalist classes in these countries, by the very logic of their weak class position, resort to unscrupulous methods in production, management, securing of licences, in trading operations, in budgeting, in evading taxation and in elaborating a complicated structure of blackmarketing and fraudulent accounting. The capitalist state, which is elaborated to perpetuate and develop the capitalist economic order in these backward countries, has to condone, ignore or even indirectly permit these nefarious but inevitable processes of the capitalist social order. Nay, a peculiar *liaison* between the class and its competing sections on one side, and the various echelons of the administrative hierarchy (including even the ministerial groups) on the other, emerges corroding and poisoning the entire body politic of these countries. Further, as the capitalist class as well as its state controls and shapes the economic policies, the polity, and the social, intellectual and aesthetic culture of the people, they vitiate all these domains of the social life. When under the impact of these conditions the political disequilibrium becomes so aggravated that it either threatens to disintegrate the existing society itself or evokes a likely revolutionary overthrow of the same, the ruling class throws off the democratic mask, discards democratic forms of class rule and instals its naked military class dictatorship. The historical tendency in most of these countries headed by the bourgeoisie is towards this transformation (Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia and others).⁷

6. D. R. Gadgil: *Economic Policy and Development*, pp. 172-173

7. Refer to the works of Ball, Kahin and others

EMERGENCE OF THE SOCIALIST BLOC

During the post-World War period, the prevailing capitalist economic systems and capitalist political regimes were eliminated from all East European countries including Yugoslavia as well as from China. Excepting in Yugoslavia and China, this transformation was brought about not by indigenous proletarian revolutions as in Russia in 1918, but by the Soviet Union, mainly by means of its Red Army which had occupied those countries in the process of its victorious struggle against Nazi Germany. The Soviet Union set up new communist states headed by the respective national communist parties in those countries which, with the military and political support of the Soviet Union, abolished capitalism and landlordism in those countries and substituted socialist property forms in varying degrees.

Thus the Soviet Union accomplished, by military bureaucratic methods, the socio-economic transformation of the societies of these countries and created communist states led by national communist parties in that zone.

Having originated in this manner, these communist regimes inevitably became subservient to the Soviet Union and, to varying extent, their economies and foreign policies were subordinated to those of the Soviet Union. In brief the East European countries became satellites of the Soviet Union.

In contrast to this development, in Yugoslavia and in China, the overthrow of the capitalist regimes and the creation of new socialist property forms were brought about by indigenous mass revolutions led by the respective communist parties of those countries. Consequently, the new communist regimes which were established there have been independent of Moscow and pursue their independent domestic and foreign policies.

ITS SIGNIFICANCE

As a result of the overthrow of capitalism in all these countries, world capitalism lost new areas to socialism during the post-World War period. Due to the new socialist property forms, the national economies of all those countries made rapid advance which was reflected in the amazing increase of the social, political and military strength of the socialist world.

As Professor Gadgil observes, "The largest numbers of recent

cases of development of underdeveloped areas are within the communist block of countries."⁸

The correlation of forces between the capitalist world and the socialist world has been thus continuously shifting in favour of the latter resulting into the ever-sharpening conflict between declining capitalism and advancing socialism. This has unfolded the threat of a third world war fought with deadly nuclear weapons for mankind.

BUREAUCRATIC DEFORMITIES

All these socialist states are characterised by bureaucratic deformity. They are not based on socialist democracy which was visualized as a higher form of democracy than bourgeois democracy i.e. the formal democracy prevailing in the democratic capitalist countries. On the admission even of prominent communist leaders like Khrushchev, Mikoyan and others, for decades constituting the Stalin Era, there was rampant in the Soviet Union and East European countries a regime of bureaucratic terror under which individual liberty was ruthlessly suppressed and people shot and imprisoned on a mass scale.⁹

Further, the most powerful member of the socialist bloc, viz. the Soviet Union has been dominating other socialist states and also adopting pressure to coerce independent communist Yugoslavia to submit to its domination.

Within the individual communist countries including Yugoslavia and China, the communist regimes are based not on socialist democracy but on the negation of individual liberty and socialist democratic freedoms. The incarceration of Djilas, an outstanding communist leader, for differences of views eloquently demonstrates that socialist democracy is non-existent even in Yugoslavia. The fate of the "Hundred Flowers" in China also reveals the same reality.

MAJOR TENSIONS IN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Thus even the socialist bloc is not a harmonious entity but is suffering from deep contradictions and conflicts. The principal

8. D. R. Gadgil op. cit. p. 173.

9. Refer to the speeches made in the Congress of C.P.S. Union

among these contradictions are as follows:

(1) Within each socialist country the contradiction and the resultant conflict between the people and the ruling bureaucracy expressed through popular discontent which constrained the Soviet Union leadership to relax to some degree the bureaucratic oppression of the people, which also exploded into the Poznan Revolt in Poland, workers' uprising in East Germany and in a classical heroic form in the Hungarian Revolution.

(2) The contradiction and the resultant conflict between the Soviet Union and the satellite states dominated by the former. All revolts in the various East European states mentioned above were directed not only against the indigenous bureaucratic regimes but also against the Soviet Union which maintained those regimes and actively intervened on their side when the peoples of those countries revolted against them. The peoples of those countries feel the pressure of national oppression at the hands of the Soviet Union.

(3) The contradiction and the resultant conflict between the Soviet bloc countries and Yugoslavia expressed through almost uninterrupted economic, political and even military (through staging frontier incidents) pressure exerted by the former led by the Soviet Union on the latter. The objective of this pressure has been to compel independent communist Yugoslavia to join the Soviet bloc and accept the domination of the Soviet Union in the domain of domestic and foreign policies.

CHINA'S UNIQUE FEATURES

China occupies a unique position in the world socialist camp. The communist party of China captured state power without the aid of the Red Army of the Soviet Union and through the revolution of the Chinese masses which it led. China, hence, is independent of the Soviet Union (though closely affiliated to it) and pursues its own independent domestic and foreign policies. China is too big and mighty for the Soviet Union to adopt towards it the same coercive methods which the latter uses against Yugoslavia for constraining it to surrender its independent initiative in the sphere of its domestic and foreign policies.

The communist regime in China too is not based on socialist democracy but on the bureaucratic suppression of the views even of those who are communists but who suggest different methods

and policies to build a communist society in China or defend the communist state. In all communist countries the bureaucratic ruling groups have claimed that they alone are infallible interpreters of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. In the Soviet Union the purging of the opposition continues even after the death of Stalin as revealed by the fate of Beria, Malenkov, Bulganin, Kaganovich and others.

In spite of these bureaucratic deformities and resultant conflicts within the countries of the Socialist bloc, they have made enormous economic and social progress. This conclusively demonstrates the superiority of the socialist economic forms (however distortedly they might be operating) over the capitalist economic forms. The Soviet Union has grown, within a few decades, into a titan of amazing technological and economic strength and that too in spite of the great ravages of war experienced by it during the World War II.

FUTURE TRENDS IN SOVIET BLOC

Due to the emergence of such historical factors as the formidable social and economic advance in the socialist countries, the further advance of the national liberation struggles of the subject peoples and the victory of the Chinese revolution, the peoples of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are feeling an irresistible urge for freedom from their bureaucratic regimes. This unfolds the perspective of greater struggles of the peoples of these countries for socialist democracy and for more normal development of productive forces unfettered by bureaucratic distortions.

FUNCTION OF COMMUNIST PARTIES OUTSIDE THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

It must also be noted that the communist parties of the countries comprising the non-communist world are looking to the communist party of the Soviet Union (and now sometimes to the communist party of China) for political and ideological guidance. Generally, they shape their policies to suit the exigencies of the current foreign policy of the Soviet government. When the political strategy embodied in the foreign policy of the Soviet government is to win over the national bourgeoisies of specific countries on the side of the Soviet Union, the communist parties of those countries

formulate class collaborationist lines. They do not derive their policies and programmes from the objective situation prevailing in these countries, from the needs of development of the socialist movement there.

In general, the foreign policy of the Soviet government is based on the subordination of the international class struggle to the requirements of the defence of the Soviet Union as conceived by the ruling communist party of the Soviet Union.

CONTEMPORARY WORLD SCENE

The movement of the contemporary world society is the resultant of the interplay of a number of contradictions and consequent conflicts, viz. those between the capitalist world and the socialist world; the capitalist classes and the working classes in capitalist countries; imperialist powers and colonial peoples; bureaucratic regimes and the peoples in various socialist countries struggling for socialist democracy; also between imperialist powers struggling to oust one another from economic areas; between feudal classes, the capitalist classes and the toiling masses in all backward countries; also between socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and others.

The antagonism between the capitalist world headed by the U.S.A. and the Socialist World headed by the Soviet Union dominates the world situation today. It represents the conflict between the two qualitatively different social systems, the capitalist and the socialist. The social world has been polarized into two distinct blocs.

There exist weak and backward nations in various stages of capitalist evolution. Each bloc is endeavouring to win over to its side these uncommitted nations.

World capitalism is historically outmoded and is in a state of increasing crisis. Its main condition of existence viz. profitable market is progressively shrinking. Vast areas of the world have been lost to it due to the victory of socialism in a number of countries during the post-war period. The necessity of continuous expansion (of markets for increasing products, larger and larger volumes of raw materials for its developing industries, more extensive area for the investment of its surplus capital) is inherent in capitalism. Even the most powerful capitalist country viz. the U.S.A. has been able to maintain its stability in the post-War period

by evolving such devices as switching on a considerable part of its productive power in the sphere of armaments, stupendous financial and armament aid to other countries (thus providing outlet for its surplus capital), curtailing agricultural production and others. Capitalism in advanced countries feels suffocated by the very amazing development of its productive forces. The economic territory for world capitalism is also further shrinking.

While the debacle of world capitalism is being daily aggravated, the countries of the socialist world, though characterised by an acute bureaucratic deformity in their political superstructures, are making phenomenal economic progress. This is basically due to the new economic foundations viz. the social ownership of the means of production rather than their bureaucratic regimes which only distort this advance. The social ownership of the means of production makes universal and structural planning possible.

C

U.N.O.: ITS ROLE

ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Numerous attempts have been made during the post-War period to overcome or soften the antagonisms of the world social systems. The U.N.O. was conceived and created for this very purpose, for resolving all conflicts through the technique of negotiations, arbitration of disputes, moral pressure of the majority decisions of the U.N.O. and others. The U.N.O. represents an attempt to solve all conflicts in the international world by peacefeul means, by the organized moral authority of a world organization. In spite of this, the antagonisms of the world system continue to persist, nay, have been aggravated. Local wars and other forms of conflict continue to break out.

The critics have indicated a number of lacuna in the Constitution and the functioning of the world assembly. Some have remarked that the Great Powers have been armed with the undemocratic right of veto which helps them to negate the majority decisions when their respective vital interests are threatened. Further, such a big country as the People's Republic of China has been still excluded from it which reduces its effectiveness. Others argue that unless its decisions are backed with the power of phy-

sical enforcement there is no guarantee that the nation against which an adverse decision is given will accept and carry it out. They cite a number of instances to support their view.

In fact, the U.N.O. has hitherto mainly become the world arena of antagonistic social forces with often fundamentally conflicting interests, such as capitalist countries and communist countries, powerful capitalist countries and weak capitalist countries, one backward country and another (e.g. India vs. Pakistan, Egypt vs. Israel and others).

It is an utopian dream to persuade sovereign national states to surrender their fundamental sovereignty and accept the U.N.O. as a super-national sovereign world organization. On minor questions, they may, under moral political pressure, bow to the will of the U.N.O. but when vital interests are involved, they are hardly expected to carry out the decisions of the world body.

Further, interests and not abstract ethical or democratic norms usually guide the behaviour of the constituent nations comprising the U.N.O. In fact, the U.N.O. has become mainly a battleground for the struggle between the capitalist nations headed by the U.S.A. and the communist nations headed by the Soviet Union. Numerous small nations of the world, with a few exceptions only, are aligned to this bloc or that.

The conflicts between capitalism and communism, imperialist powers and subject colonial peoples, between imperialists themselves, are fundamental. This fact has rendered all well-meant efforts to eliminate conflict and establish peace in the world hitherto abortive.

Explosive points threatening wars have been only shifting: yesterday Korea, Viet Nam or Suez; today Berlin, Iraq or Ladakh. A number of countries at a given moment have been always in the grip of turmoil.

Both the capitalist world and the socialist world have their own varieties of tensions and struggles.

N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. AND OTHER POWER COALITIONS

In addition to the U.N.O. which has the character of a world organization, there have come into existence, a number of limited coalitions of groups of states, political and military. These are the N.A.T.O., the Warsaw Pact, the S.E.A.T.O., the British Commonwealth, the Bagdad Pact, the Bandung Conference, the Afro-

Asian Block and others to serve the interests of the coalescing states. One peculiarity of these coalitions is that sometimes a state which is a member of one coalition which includes an imperialist power is simultaneously a member of another coalition which includes a subject nation whom that imperialist power dominates. For instance, India is a member of the British Commonwealth which includes imperialist Britain and is at the same time a member of the Bandung Conference and Afro-Asian Bloc which have among them member states like Malaya and others which are still under the subjection of Britain. This is due to the fact that the interests of nations (economic, political, strategic and others) are not uniform, are varied and, further, are immediate as well as fundamental. The economic and sometimes military dependence of weak states on imperialist powers explains in part this contradictory phenomenon. The capitalist world is based on inherent conflict among capitalist nations by the very competitive nature of the capitalist economy and, hence, while there will always remain a tendency to unite against the common danger of socialism among them, there also will perennially persist struggle among them in the economic and hence political and military domains. Self-expansion is the law of the living organism of capitalism. Hence there exist, through different permutations and combinations, various coalitions of capitalist states.

Some of these coalitions have mainly strategic objectives. For instance, the N.A.T.O., the S.E.A.T.O., and the Bagdad Pact on the imperialist side and the Warsaw Pact on the side of the Soviet Union, have been designed as a part of the advance preparations if the war breaks out between the capitalist and socialist states.

Earnest attempts have been and are being made to resolve peacefully the multifold conflicts which rend the contemporary world social system but the conflicts in fact have been hitherto only aggravated. Periodically this region or that region (the Middle East, the Chinese Mainland and the Formosa Zone, countries of Latin America, parts of Africa, South-East and even Europe) blazes up sometimes threatening the eruption of a catastrophic nuclear world war.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVE

World capitalist and colonial systems have historically been out-moded. This is revealed in the fact that a number of states have

declared as their social objective the establishment of a socialist society. Whether these countries have a confused conception of socialism and mistake state capitalism as socialism or not is beside the point. The fact that in an increasing number of countries, governments refuse to declare themselves as capitalist is the most eloquent admission of the fact that capitalism as a socio-economic system is historically outmoded.

The bureaucratic deformity characterizing the societies of the socialist countries, which are based on the socialist economic principle of the social ownership of the means of production, is alien to socialism. The struggles of the peoples of these countries against the bureaucratic regimes to remove this deformity are inevitable and have already started. However, in those countries the new social system higher than the capitalist system has emerged though with a deformity.

Since the colossal productive forces of modern human society have come not only in collision with capitalist economic relations but have a world character and therefore have come in collision with even national boundaries, the socialist society can and will be built only on a world basis enveloping entire mankind. It is difficult to visualise in very great details the road to this final objective.

Such is the picture of the world situation and the direction of its development through zigzags and even unpredictable turns.

SECTION TWO

NATIONALISM IN INDIA DURING THE WAR PERIOD

A

OUR PROGNOSIS

WE WILL now study the development of Nationalism in India during the intra-War and post-War period till the British rulers transferred power to the Indians. This phase has crucial significance since it is crowded with developments which culminated into the acquisition of political independence by the Indian people. This is particularly so because the transfer of power was the outcome of unique historical circumstances and tortuous diplomatic bargainings. Within the limited space of this small work which has emerged as a Post Script to 'Social Background of Indian Nationalism', it is possible only to narrate that process briefly and in its main outlines.

In the Epilogue of the 'Social Background of Indian Nationalism', we ventured to make a prognosis of this phase of the development of Indian Nationalism. This prognosis was based on the major postulates which have guided the analysis of the subject under discussion. We stated as follows:

"However, considering that the Indian capitalist class appreciably added to its economic and social strength during the period of the present World War II and is led by a group of politicians who possess great experience and consummate political and strategic talent in contrast to the awakened lower layers of the Indian society who are culturally backward, organizationally weaker, and politically less conscious than the bourgeoisie and, further, are led by groups of persons smaller in political stature and experience, it is very likely that, in its immediate next stage, the Indian nationalist movement will be dominated by and made to subserve the interests of the capitalist class.

"The direction of development of Indian history and the nationalist movement in the next phase led by and subserving the interests of the capitalist class, can be broadly indicated.

"The first feature of this development will be the working out

of the policy of 'Concessions and Counterpoise' by British Imperialism on a much grander scale in the changed historical situation to win over increased sections of the vested interests for its support, and also to stimulate more bitter rivalries among them to its advantage. This will result in a more intensified struggle among these sections and will accentuate communalism and inter-provincial antagonisms.

"The second feature of the development will consist in that the leaders of the vested interests will oppose mass movements of lower strata of the population or will distort and canalise these movements for gaining concessions from British Imperialism as well as from sectional rivals.

"Constitutionalism, sharpened communalism, accentuated inter-provincial rivalries, and opposition to or increased distortions of the growing mass struggles by the leaders of the vested interests are likely to be the principal characteristics of the next phase of Indian development." (pp. 391).

The above historical prediction has been appreciably corroborated in its basic outline by developments which have taken place during the subsequent period. This confirms our view that the method of Historical Materialism provides a most fruitful approach to correctly analyse, evaluate and prognosticate social phenomena.

We will now briefly describe the development of Indian nationalism upto Independence.

During the period of the Second World War the tempo of history quickened at an unprecedented rate. The struggle of the Indian people for national independence became more militant, rose to new heights, assumed new forms.

In the new historical situation British Imperialism, involved in a perilous war with the Axis Powers evolved a new political strategy based on a new variant of the old policy of counterpoise, concessions and coercion to subserve the same objective viz. the perpetuation of its domination over India.

The Indian National Congress representing the Indian bourgeoisie and the principal leader of Indian Nationalism and the nationalist movement naturally decided to take maximum advantage of the critical situation in which Britain was placed. It strengthened and brought into action its basic strategy of negotiation and bargain backed up by the pressure of a limited mass movement or a threat of mass movement. This had been always its classic strategy suited to the peculiar historical position in which

it was placed. The principle of this strategy was to transform all anti-imperialist discontent in the country in the form of a mass movement such as would be prevented from assuming revolutionary forms and still exert pressure on Britain to make substantial concessions or even transfer power to the Indian bourgeoisie. The Indian National Congress fully realized that a revolutionary mass movement would not stop at ending British Imperialism but also would end the Indian propertied classes.

The Muslim League, the party of the Muslim feudo-capitalist classes, had defined the creation of an independent state of Pakistan, (parts of India predominantly inhabited by the Muslims) as its goal. It recognized the inherent weakness in the position of the Indian National Congress, bargained with and brought pressure on the latter with the threat and even actual precipitating of communal disturbances in the country. It reinforced this method with that of utilizing for its own advantage the policy of counterpoise which Britain had invented for its own purpose.

The Communist Party of India pursued the policy of developing and leading anti-imperialist mass struggle during the first phase of the War, when the war continued between the democratic and fascist imperialist powers and when the Soviet Union was not involved. But when Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union and Britain and other democratic imperialist powers entered into a war alliance with the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of India turned a volte-face, glorified the War as a Peoples' War and opposed all struggles for independence from the British rule. It, in fact, directly or indirectly helped the war efforts of the British government. By abstaining from and even opposing the nationalist mass upsurge, the C.P.I. betrayed the national liberation struggle and left the leadership of the movement to the compromising Indian National Congress and the reactionary communal Muslim League.

The Congress Socialist Party attempted to interpret the Congress strategy in more radical terms and tried to carry forward that strategy by developing mass movements after 1942. But its activities, though heroic, were not enlightened by a deep political vision or guided by a correct strategy of mass movements.

"The Second World War brought extreme inflation, disorganization and famine in the economic field." While the bourgeoisie, taking advantage of the acute scarcity of the consumers' goods as well as of the increased demand for war necessities, reaped fabu-

lous profits and, that too, through most inhuman profiteering and unscrupulous black-marketing activities, the Indian masses and the lower middle classes suffered unbearable privations. Political and economic discontent among the people consequently was aggravated and the class struggles of the workers, the peasants, and the middle class employees during the latter phases of the War and during the immediate Post-War period became a regular feature of the situation. The discontent spread even among the police, armed forces and services creating an explosive revolutionary situation. It was in this situation that British Imperialism, the Indian National Congress, the Muslim League and other political parties evolved their respective plans to secure maximum benefits in whatever new political pattern may emerge as a result of struggle and negotiations.

B

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

CLASSIC OPPORTUNITY FOR INDIAN BOURGEOISIE

We will next indicate the decisive economic developments which took place in India during the war and post-war period, and which brought about changes in the Indian national economy, changes in the position of various classes and their respective movements.

As we have previously seen, the Indian national economy was a subordinate colonial adjunct of the British imperialist economy. By her economic and political policies, Britain had obstructed the free and rapid industrialization of India. She, particularly, did not permit the development of heavy industries, the vital prerequisite for the rapid industrialization of a country and for the building up of an independent national economy.

During the period of the Second World War, national economies of Britain and other highly developed industrial countries were almost entirely mobilised for meeting the requirements of the war. This provided a classic opportunity to the Indian industrialists to capture the Indian market and, thereby, to expand their industries.

"The following table shows in index numbers, the development in various industries during the war period."¹⁰

10. Prof. P.A. Wadia and Prof. K.T. Merchant: *Our Economic Problems* (5th Edition) p. 430

1937 = 100

	Cotton Tex- tiles	Jute	Steel	Chemi- cals	Sugar	Cement	Paper	Gene- ral
1938	109.0	98.3	108.0	84.4	88.7	124.8	121.6	105.4
1939	104.3	92.4	125.0	103.9	62.5	152.9	135.1	102.7
1940	103.6	96.1	125.5	133.3	106.0	152.1	169.7	109.9
1941	114.8	92.4	131.1	153.2	108.2	185.8	195.4	117.8
1942	102.0	99.5	136.7	138.7	78.4	194.5	180.9	111.2
1943	117.0	84.4	141.5	138.6	95.3	188.4	179.2	117.0
1944	122.9	86.7	139.6	126.3	97.1	182.1	192.7	117.0
1945	120.0	84.4	142.9	134.1	85.5	196.5	196.5	120.0

"The conditions created by the war led to the maximum utilisation of the existing capacity of Indian industries though they were not quite favourable for the development of new industries on a large scale. A number of industries, however, like ferro-alloys, non-ferrous metals like aluminium and antimony, diesel engines, pumps, bicycles and sewing machines, chemicals like soda ash, caustic soda, chlorine and superphosphates, and certain kinds of machine tools, were started on a modest scale during the period of the Second World War. A greater stimulus was, however, given to medium and small-scale industries like cutlery, pharmaceuticals, medicines and drugs. The conditions of inflation and a sellers' market gave a great impetus to the production in established industries which worked multiple shifts but the difficulties of imports of essential requirements led to tremendous wear and tear."¹¹

THE BRITISH ECONOMIC POLICY

The British government, however, even then did not give unrestricted freedom for the expansion of the Indian industries, light as well as heavy. The *Eastern Economist* observed:

"We could make everything and yet nothing. We were just suppliers of anything and everything, menders and repairers of all things on earth, but the makers of none. We had no system, no plan. Rather, there was a plan—clearcut and thorough—to prevent the industrialization of this country in the post-war period."¹²

11. *Ibid.* p. 431

12. *Eastern Economist*, August, 31st 1945

Britain did not permit free expansion of the Indian industries during the war period because she was afraid that an industrially developed India armed with a strong heavy industry would prove a powerful competitor during the post-war period.

On the ground of lack of shipping resources and by restricting capital issues the government did not permit India to freely import much capital goods from foreign countries during the war period. Hence the Indian industrialists not only could not establish new industrial enterprises but were constrained to overwork the existing industrial plants to meet the demands of the market which had expanded as a result of the almost complete stoppage of import of foreign goods and also due to the government's orders for war necessities. In fact, the expansion of production during the war period was due to "the reckless overworking of existing plant and machinery and more man-power shifts."¹³

Even regarding orders for war supplies, the Eastern Group Supply Council, the basic organisation to distribute orders to different countries of the Empire, heavily discriminated against India. Referring to it, M. Visvesvaraya states as follows:

"The orders for products required for the present war seem to have been distributed among the various belligerent countries within the Empire on the advice of the Roger Mission and the Eastern Group Supply Conference. According to the arrangements made, only a few products which required no technical skill or practice seem to have been assigned to factories and industrialists in India. Products requiring heavy industries or higher technical skill were allotted to the U.S.A. and the Dominions of Canada and Australia."¹⁴

Absence of any large orders for the products of heavy industries by the Council was one of the major reasons why Indian heavy industries could not appreciably expand during the war period.

Britain retained her grip over the sterling balances accumulated in favour of India and to be paid by Britain to India in connection with war expenses incurred by the latter on behalf of the former. Britain did not allow India to make use of these balances during the war and post-war periods to import consumers' or capital goods according to the basic requirement of the national need.

13. Ibid. March 5th 1956

14. Sir M. Visvesvaraya: *Prosperity through Industry*, *p. 15

RECKLESS PROFITTEERING

The rising inflationary spiral during the war period brought increasing privations to the common people who suffered from acute shortage of even prime necessities of life.

Though the common people of India were impoverished during the war due to the rise of prices of even basic necessities of life, the industrialists, the merchants and businessmen made colossal profits. As pointed out by many economists, even in the pre-War period, the rate of profit was very much higher in India than elsewhere (particularly in advanced countries). The war enhanced the profits enormously. The patriotic capitalists, who have been always posing as representatives of national interests, even exploited the war situation and people's intensified hardships to amass fabulous profits. This can be seen from the following table:

Index numbers of average net profits in 1943 in different Industries.¹⁵

(1939 = 100)			
Jute	926	Coal	124
Cotton	645	Engineering	225
Tea	392	Miscellaneous	401
Sugar	218	All kinds	327

Demand for the increase in dearness allowance was not met in any industry during 1944. "The Government of India in its concern began freezing part of the wages for the duration of the war. The impact of the soaring prices and the inadequacy of the dearness allowances to keep up the cost of living can be seen from the fact that in 1943 the working days lost in strikes were 1,291,100 whereas upto October 1944 they were 3,779,000 days."¹⁶

As Professors Wadia and Merchant very trenchantly point out, "this accumulation of capital had not been based on any productive economic development or industrial advance during the war. The contradiction between the inflated wealth of the Indian capitalist class and the low level of Indian economic development was glaring."¹⁷

15. Prof. Wadia and K.T. Merchant op. cit. p. 571.

16. Ibid. 571

17. Ibid.

CHANGING POSITION OF BRITISH AND INDIAN CAPITALISTS

The respective strength of British and Indian capital however changed in favour of the latter at the end of the war. •

“Indians recently grown rich and powerful due to inflationary conditions and profits from war contracts are attempting to buy out British interests.”¹⁸

Another reason why Indian capital which had increased during the war was spent in buying out British enterprises was its inability to secure industrial plant from foreign countries due to war conditions. “Hampered by the non-availability of machinery imports during the war, unable to invest in any large measure in new industries, this huge mass of newly accumulated capital in Indian hands gravitated inevitably to industries already well-established in this country under foreign ownership. Complete or partial buying out of British concerns by Indian interests became a significant phenomenon during the war and immediately after and to the British interests concerned was not unwelcome in view of the uncertain political future in India and Asia generally.”¹⁹

NEW ERA OF FUSION OF INDIAN AND FOREIGN CAPITAL

Subsequently, the tendency of a fusion of Indian and foreign capitals developed.

Though there existed before the war some joint economic enterprises in which both foreign and Indian capitals were combined, however, on the whole, there was little fusion of both capitals. A new economic feature emerged after the war. British capitalism which had emerged weakened from the war evolved a manoeuvre to safeguard its interests in India, that of Joint Anglo-Indian enterprises in India.

This was facilitated by the fact that India was weak in capital resources. An era of a fusion of Indian and British interests in new and old concerns on an increasing scale opened.

“Andrew Yule and Co. controlling 78 companies, Gillanders Arbuthnot controlling 70, Octavious Steel and Co. agents for 57 companies, Mcleod controlling 39 companies and Jardine Henderson and Co., have now Indian directors on their boards and are some characteristic examples of the rapid growth of the pheno-

18. *Daily Express*, 1949

19. *Supplement to Capital*, Dec., 22nd 1949

menon of the fusion of British and Indian capitals. The development of a fusion of interests in existing enterprises foreshadowed the pattern of new investments by foreign capital in the country."²⁰

American capital in alliance with Indian capital has also been establishing joint economic enterprises in India since 1946. "Side by side with these, Indian Business has also been putting through such deals with American Business. The Indo-American deals are spread almost all over the new industries to be developed in India—automobiles, radio manufacture, plastics, agricultural machinery, certain branches of the chemical industry, artificial silk and the manufacture of machinery for industrial use".²¹

We will discuss the implication of these post-war developments subsequently.

C

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS

We will now briefly indicate the history of nationalism in India in the political field during the period of the Second World War, which finally culminated into the withdrawal of the British Rule.

INDIA ARBITRARILY MADE PARTICIPANT IN WAR

India was made a participant in the war on the side of Britain without any consent of the Indian people expressed through its representatives. Immediately after Britain declared war on Germany in 1939, the Viceroy, without consulting the leaders of the Indian people, proclaimed India a belligerent. The British Parliament passed also the Government of India Amending Act which invested the Viceroy with the power to override the working of the Constitution. Through Defence of India Ordinance of 1939, the Central Government armed itself with powers to rule by decrees and promulgations.

The arbitrary committing of India to the War by the Viceroy, the representative of the British rule in India, together with the assumption of autocratic powers by him created deep resentment among the Indian people.

20. Ibid

21. Ibid

I. N. CONGRESS AND BRITISH GOVERNMENT

Under these circumstances, the Indian National Congress, the leader of the nationalist movement, evaluated the war as an imperialist war and refused to associate with it. In a statement, its Working Committee declared that "The Committee cannot associate themselves or offer any co-operation in a war which is conducted on imperialist lines and which is meant to consolidate imperialism in India and everywhere." It further declared, "The Working Committee, therefore, invites the British Government to declare in unequivocal terms what their war aims are in regard to democracy and imperialism and the new order that is envisaged in particular, how these aims are going to apply to India and to be given effect to in the present. Do they include the treatment of India as a free nation whose policy will be guided in accordance with the wishes of her people?" (September 1939).

The British Government declined to meet the demand of the Congress. It only reiterated its promise of Dominion Status for India in future.

Again in 1940, the Congress expressed its willingness to co-operate in war provided Britain conceded the demand of national independence for India and established a Provisional National Government at the Centre which, though formed as a transitional measure, should be such as to command the confidence of all elected members in the Central Legislature if these measures are adopted, it will enable the Congress to throw in its full weight in the efforts for the effective organisation of the defence of the country" (July 1940).

The British Government rejected the Congress proposal on the ground that the Muslim League representing the Muslim community and the Princes would not consent to it. The Viceroy put forth a counter-plan which included the establishment, after the end of the war, of a body of representatives of the principal elements in India's national life in order to devise the framework of the new Constitution, "the enlargement of the Viceroy's Executive Council by the addition of nominated Indians", and "the appointment of a 'War Advisory Council' of the representatives of the Indian States and other Indians." (August 1940).

INDIVIDUAL CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

After experiencing repeated failures to secure national indepen-

dence through negotiation, the Congress finally launched individual civil disobedience in October 1940. The limited programme of struggle indicated that the Congress leadership did not desire to seriously obstruct Britain in War.

NEW SITUATION IN WAR

After Germany attacked the Soviet Union at the end of 1941, and Japan attacked Pearl Harbour, the war alliance between Britain, France and other countries was broadened into the United Nations including the Soviet Union, the U.S.A. and China within it.

The Atlantic Charter sponsored by Britain and the U.S.A. declared as a part of the war aim the restoration of "sovereign rights and self-government" to those peoples who had been forcibly deprived of them. The Charter kindled optimism among the Congress leaders.

After Germany attacked the Soviet Union and Japan the Philippines thus threatening other Asiatic countries including India, the Congress discarded its former characterization of the war as an imperialist war. It now described the war as an anti-fascist war. In 1942, it categorically named the Axis-Powers as aggressors and declared its sympathy for nations which were victims of those powers. It further stated that "only a free independent India can be in a position to undertake the defence of the country on a national basis."

CRIPPS MISSION TO INDIA

The triumphant advance of the Japanese army on the Asiatic mainland culminating into its capture of Rangoon impressed upon Britain the necessity of conciliating India. Britain realised that without mobilizing the support of the Indian people, it was difficult to resist any Japanese invasion of India. The British War Cabinet therefore sent the Cripps Mission to India to negotiate a political settlement with the Indian leaders. The attempt, however, proved abortive since Britain refused to meet the demand of the Indian nationalist leaders for a war-time national government with full powers. Though the nationalist leaders were ready to be satisfied with Britain's promise of transfer of power after the end of the war and even agreed to accept the Viceroy as the head of the war-time national government, they insisted that the wartime national

government should be invested with full powers. The British Government, however, declined to concede this demand and the negotiations broke down.

While the leaders of the Indian National Congress had taken an anti-fascist stand naming the Axis-Powers as aggressors, while they were prepared to accept Britain's grant of national independence to India after the end of the war and also to undertake the organisation of the defence of India through a national government with full powers, there were two other nationalist groups in the country which considered the hope of securing national independence through negotiation with British imperialism, even though the latter was enmeshed in a war crisis, as utopian and advocated a militant countrywide mass struggle as the only means to win freedom. There was, however, a divergence of opinion among these groups regarding the attitude to be adopted towards Japan. One group evaluated Japan as the enemy of peoples and hence rejected the idea of even temporarily alligning with her for tactical reasons in the struggle against Britain for freedom. The other group headed by Subhas Bose, on the other hand, held the view that the Indians could utilize the Japanese aid to eliminate British domination over India and win independence.

A basic weakness of the nationalist movement was the failure of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League to unite and unitedly present the national demand to the British Government. "In the development of the national movement for freedom, there appeared a wider and wider rift between the two major political parties in India—the Congress, on the one hand, organised on a national basis and the Muslim League, on the other, organised on a communal basis as an authoritative organisation of Muslim opinion. It is more and more evident that while the Congress demanded independence on the basis of a unitary India, the Muslim League based its achievement of independence on a division of India into two sections, Pakistan and Hindustan."²²

British statesmen adroitly exploited and utilised this cleavage between the two most powerful political organisations in the country, to prevent their united pressure for the national demand. Thus Indian Nationalism was seriously weakened by Communalism.

The minds of the Congress leaders were torn between two contradictory sentiments. On the one hand they desired to co-ope-

22. B.N. Vekratnam: *National Movements and Constitutional Developments*

rate with the United Nations in fighting fascist aggression; on the other, they desired the Indian people to co-operate with the United Nations in the anti-fascist war as a free people. When the British Government declined to meet even their compromise demand viz. postponement of the establishment of national independence till the end of the war but creation of a war-time national government with full powers, they felt they had no alternative except that of starting a struggle to enforce the national demand.

THE FAMOUS AUGUST RESOLUTION OF 1942

The Congress passed a resolution in August 1942 declaring that "An immediate ending of British rule in India is an urgent necessity both for the sake of India and the success of the cause of the United Nations." The Congress further resolved "to sanction the starting of a mass struggle on the widest possible scale so that the country may utilize all the non-violent strength it has gathered during the last 22 years of peaceful struggle."

As Mahatma Gandhi subsequently clarified, the resolution of struggle was more intended to exert pressure on the British Government to reopen negotiations rather than to start an immediate struggle. This is confirmed by the fact that the resolution also stated that "The Committee is anxious not to embarrass in any way the defence of China or Russia whose freedom is precious and must be preserved or jeopardise the defensive capacity of the United Nations".

BRILLIANT STRATEGY

Professor D. D. Kosambi has interesting observations to make on the brilliant strategic significance of the 1942 Resolution. While evaluating Pandit Nehru's version of the same as embodied in "Discovery of India" he comments as follows:

"When the All India Congress Committee met at Bombay, the members knew that arrest was imminent and most of them had prepared for the event by setting their family affairs and personal finances in excellent order against all contingencies that might arise for the next year or two. What strikes this writer as remarkable is that not one of these worthy and able delegates, though aware that the British adversary was about to strike, ever thought of a plan of action for the Congress and for the nation as a whole.

The general idea was 'the Mahatma will give us a plan', yet no especial impression was made by the Mahatma's speech just before the arrests—though that address to the assembled delegates on the eve of an anticipated popular explosion is not only not revolutionary in character, nor a plan of action of any sort, but seems, when taken objectively, to be on the same level as a comfortable after-dinner speech. Why is it that knowledge of popular dissatisfaction went hand in hand with the absence of a real plan of action? Does it mean, for example, that the characteristic thought then current among the Indian bourgeoisie had in effect permeated the Congress leadership? One may note that on a class basis the action was quite brilliant, no matter how futile it may have seemed on a national revolutionary scale. The panic of the British Government and jailing of all leaders absolved the Congress from any responsibility for the happenings of the ensuing year; at the same time the glamour of jail and concentration camp served to wipe out the so-so record of the Congress ministries in office, thereby restoring the full popularity of the organization among the masses. If the British won the war it was quite clear that the Congress had not favoured Japan; if on the other hand the Japanese succeeded in conquering India (and they had only to attack immediately in force for the whole of the so-called defence system to crumble) they could certainly not accuse the Congress of having helped the British. Finally, the hatred for the mass repression fell upon the thick heads of the bureaucracy, while having the discontent brought to a head and smashed wide open would certainly not injure the Indian bourgeoisie . . . You look in vain in Nehru's book for any recognition of the undeniable fact that in 1942, while the toiling masses had begun to taste the utmost depths of misery and degradation, the Indian bourgeoisie was flourishing as never before. War contracts, high prices, the ability to do extensive black-marketing, had given the financiers and industrialists what they wanted Taking cognizance of this and of the further truth that the British in India had consistently allowed investors to make an increasing amount of profit in this country, one may be able to account for the lack of a plan in 1942 and for the successive deadlocks that followed in spite of mass pressure in the direction of revolution."²³

POLITICAL STALEMATE

The government forestalled the launching of any movement by arresting prominent Congress leaders and proscribing the Congress organisation. This led to large-scale spontaneous disturbances all over the country which, in the absence of any leadership and plan of struggle, were successfully put down by the government by methods of ruthless repression. Struggles involving widespread sabotage and terrorism organised by underground revolutionary groups subsequently broke out but they were crushed by the government. Jayaprakash Narayana became the symbol of these heroic struggles. Also the attempt of Subhas Bose who organised the Indian National Army in Burma to liberate India with the aid of Japanese imperialism also failed.

There was a political stalemate in India at the time when the war ended.

During the Second World War period the national consciousness of the Indian people deepened and its urge for national independence became accentuated and more articulate. Both the Muslim League with the overwhelming section of the Muslim community behind it and the Indian National Congress with its mass support more aggressively put forth the demand of national independence. The conflict between these two major political organisations, however, sharpened and they could not unite and make a united demand for national freedom. The initial military defeats of Western colonial powers undermined the moral, political and military prestige of these powers among all Asiatics including the Indians. This gave a momentum to the urge of national independence among them as also instilled greater self-confidence among them. The organisation of the army of Indian freedom by Subhas Bose, though with the assistance of Japanese imperialism, challenged the non-violent principle of Gandhism which had determined the character of the Indian nationalist movement, and, though crushed, served to inspire movements of military and naval revolt which broke out in India in the post-war period and which influenced Britain to a great extent to revise its attitude to the demand of national independence of the Indian people.

GROWING POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC DISCONTENT AT
THE END OF THE WAR

The end of the war found India seething with grave political and

economic mass discontent. The economic suffering of the masses due to war conditions were instilling among them moods of revolt and strong urge for political and economic liberation. The country threatened to be a theatre of great mass struggles. The British Government comprehending the depth of the crisis decided to send a Cabinet Mission to negotiate a settlement with the Indian leaders. Farsighted Britishers sensed a dangerous situation. As P. J. Griffith, the leader of the European Group in the Indian Central Legislative Assembly remarked in his speech in London in 1946:

“India in the opinion of many was on the verge of a revolution, before the British Cabinet Mission arrived. The Cabinet Mission has at least postponed if not eliminated the danger.”

R. I. N. MUTINY

The political and economic ferment was spreading in the post-war period, not only among the civilian population but was also steadily permeating the armed forces. In February 1946 strikes broke out in the air force and the navy in a number of centres, threatening thereby the military basis of the British rule in India. This was a danger signal to Britain. Further the naval risings which broke out in Bombay, Madras and Karachi evoked great sympathy and support of the people. In Bombay, the naval rising was supported by the working and middle classes by means of sympathetic demonstrations, closing of shops and strikes. The government had to use mainly British troops to cope with the situation. It was only when Vallabhbhai Patel intervened and advised the ratings that the latter abandoned the struggle.

Large-scale political demonstrations for national independence involving clashes with the police and military were taking place in a number of centres in the country.

SIR STAFFORD CRIPPS ON NEW LINE OF IMPERIALISM

British statesmen comprehended the explosive character of the situation and conceived and inaugurated a new political line to meet the situation. The Cabinet Mission was sent to India on 19th February 1946, the day after the naval strike broke out in Bombay.

Sir Stafford Cripps retrospectively elucidated the new political line of Britain in relation to India before the Parliament in 1947 thus:

"There were fundamentally two alternatives facing the government. They could attempt to strengthen British control in India on the basis of an expanded personnel in the Secretary of State's services and a considerable reinforcement of British troops to be in a position to enforce for as long as might be necessary for our administrative responsibility while awaiting an agreement among the Indian communities. . . . The second alternative was to accept the fact that the first alternative was not possible. . . . One thing that was quite obviously impossible was to decide to continue our responsibilities infinitely and indeed against our own wishes into a period when we had not the power to carry out."

SOME PECULIAR FEATURES OF POST-WAR INDIAN SITUATION

One peculiar feature of the post-war Indian situation was that while the people of all communities were increasingly uniting and struggling in their own way for national freedom, the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, two major political organisations, were unable to come together and present a united demand for independence on an agreed basis.

Another feature of the post-war situation was that the leadership of both the Congress and the Muslim League strongly condemned the methods of struggle resorted to by the people to secure independence. Azad, the then Congress President, commented on the new developments thus:

"Strikes, hartals and defiances of temporary authority of the day are out of place. No immediate cause has arisen to join issue with the foreign rulers who are acting as caretakers."

Mahatma Gandhi scathingly condemned the growing struggle of the masses thus:

"I might have understood it if they had combined from top to bottom. That would of course have meant delivering India to the rabble. I would not want to live upto 125 to witness the consummation, I would rather perish in the flames." (Harijan, April 7, 1946).

Regarding the naval strike, Vallabhbhai Patel condemned it and "endorsed the remarks of the Commander-in-Chief that there ought to be discipline in the Navy."

The Congress leaders were hoping to secure freedom through negotiation with Britain. They did not approve of popular movements, especially when they were assuming revolutionary and violent forms.

CABINET MISSION

The Cabinet Mission came to India in such an explosive situation. It brought recommendations for the future constitution for India, proposals for constitution-making machinery and a plan for interim government. The Congress criticism was trenchant as revealed in the following A.I.C.C. News letter:

"The independence that has been promised is so hedged in with restrictions that it is a misnomer to call it by that name. The so-called Constituent Assembly will have the semblance but not the reality of a sovereign body. . . ."

"The Union Government without control over currency, banking, customs and planning will be weak to direct the economic progress under modern industrial conditions."

"National interest has been subordinated not only to the communal but to the feudal no less. The Princes and not their people will decide the future relations of the states to the Union."

"The communal and feudal interests have been the main props so far of the British imperial game in India. To try to maintain them as permanent and effective features of the so-called independent India gives rise to a plausible suspicion that the British Government are unable to break away from the traditional policy of their predecessors."

The Muslim League announced that while "the attainment of the goal of a complete sovereign Pakistan still remains the unalterable objective of the Moslems of India", it accepted the plan since "the basis and the foundation of Pakistan are inherent in the Mission's Plan."

The democratic criticism of the Plan can be summed up thus: It did not provide a sovereign Constituent Assembly since the constitution it evolved was subject to the endorsement by Britain. It did not provide a democratic Constituent Assembly since it was not elected on the basis of universal franchise and, further, the autocratic princes and not the peoples of the states were to choose representatives for the Assembly on behalf of the states; it injected communalism into the Constituent Assembly by providing representation to communal minority. It divided India on feudal and communal lines by providing for two Muslim majority areas and the Princely Zone. It evoked a weak Centre making thereby national planning difficult.

The extreme Left groups in the country recommended a cate-

gorical rejection of the proposals of the Cabinet Mission. They evaluated the proposed scheme as a subtle strategic device of Britain to maintain its grip over India indirectly, to concede pseudo-independence to her. One Left criticism ran thus: "The Constitutional Plan of 1946 continued the old method of elaborate balancing and counterpoise of the different elements in Indian political life, especially of building a political situation on communal antagonisms, by balancing the Congress against the Muslim League with Princes as the reactionary pivotal force, in such a way as to nullify in practice the supposed offer of Indian freedom and retain effective final control in their hands. . . . British imperialism had not yet abdicated and transferred power to the Indian people. It had rather exploited all its ingenuity and age-long experience to establish an elaborate, cumbersome, precarious machinery through which even behind the formal facade of Indian 'Independence' it would be able to continue to manoeuvre and seek to maintain its essential economic and strategic domination".

With the declaration of the Cabinet Mission that the scheme proposed by it "stands as a whole", the hope of a political settlement between Britain and India faded.

The post-war political and economic situation was in the meanwhile steadily deteriorating. In industrial centres, the strike movement of the workers was growing and assuming grave proportions. The democratic movement of the peoples of the States was gathering new momentum and extending. Popular struggles in Travancore, Hyderabad and Kashmir were reaching new heights and depths. Radical sections of the people were growing critical of the compromising policies of the nationalist leaders and their methods of winning independence through negotiations.

GROWING RIFT BETWEEN I. N. CONGRESS AND MUSLIM LEAGUE

Another feature of the situation was the rapid deterioration of the Hindu-Muslim relations. The conflict between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League regarding such problems as the nature of the state structure of a free India, the composition of the Interim Government and others, was exacerbating and accelerating communal feelings. Communal clashes of unprecedented ferocity broke out in Bengal, Bihar and other provinces, resulting in the massacre of thousands of persons. In the atmosphere of intensifying communal tension the Hindu Mahasabha

began to gather influence among increasing sections of the Hindus.

The British government recognised the gravity of the situation. "Faced with this deepening crisis, signalized equally in the advance of the working class and peasant struggles, and popular revolt against princely rule, and in the growth of political disintegration and reactionary communal conflict and anarchy, imperialism sought to hasten the time table for reaching the new political settlement." To meet the immediate crisis a Coalition Government at the centre composed of the Congress, the League and the Sikh representatives was formed. Due to acute differences among these representatives the coalition failed to function smoothly.

MOUNTBATTEN PLAN AND PARTITION OF INDIA

The rift between the Congress and the League leaders was rapidly widening. They failed to compose their differences and reach an agreement at the Conference held in London in December 1946. In the face of the deteriorating political situation, the British Government replaced Lord Wavell by Lord Mountbatten as the Viceroy of India. A new plan known as the Mountbatten Plan was evolved. The basic difference between the Cabinet Mission Plan and the Mountbatten Plan lay in the fact that while the former provided for a single united Indian state, the latter, by the implication of its terms, paved way for the political partition of India.

The leaders of the Indian National Congress at first felt reluctant to accept the Mountbatten Plan which involved the political vivisection of India. Subsequently, however, they accepted the Plan, though with great misgivings. While accepting it on behalf of the Congress, Pandit Nehru remarked, "It is with no joy in my heart that I commend these proposals". Mahatma Gandhi who at first very strongly opposed its acceptance finally recommended it.

The Left Nationalist groups in the country stood for the categorical rejection of the Plan and for the launching of a country-wide mass struggle for national independence. They interpreted the Plan as an astute political, strategic manoeuvre of politically, economically and militarily weakened post-war Britain to maintain through the Plan indirect political and economic grip over India by dividing India into two parts both of which would be politically and economically weakened and therefore constrained to be dependent on Britain. Further, they said, the partition of India on a religious basis would not eliminate communalism but only lift it to the plane of an inter-state struggle.

The British Conservatives, the staunch defenders of the Empire, supported the Plan in its fundamentals. "Economist", the organ of British Capital, commented in its issue on' June 7, 1947 on the Plan thus: "Something may remain even of the formal ties if Dominion Status is not renounced; and in any case, the essential strategic and economic ties between Britain and India will remain even if they are under different political forms".

REASONS FOR ITS ACCEPTANCE BY I. N. CONGRESS

The acceptance though reluctant of the Mountbatten Plan by the Congress leaders may perhaps be explained by three reasons. First, the Congress leaders had lost all hope of an agreement with the Muslim League to present a united demand for the unitary state of a free India. Secondly, the growing cleavage between the Congress and the League was transforming India into a cauldron of ferocious communal passions and a theatre of expanding brutal communal warfare. Thirdly, they viewed with apprehension, especially after the R.I.N. strike, the extending mass movements which were assuming violent revolutionary forms.

D

IMPLICATIONS OF PARTITION

The partition of India into the states of Pakistan and the Indian Union destroyed the political unification of the Indian people accomplished by Britain. It also brought into existence new problems.

Since India was partitioned not on nationality or linguistic but on religious lines, the problem of religious minorities in both states emerged in a permanent form. The partition also led to a sharp communal conflict instigated mainly by reactionary communal forces. This resulted in a large-scale uprooting of millions of members of both the Hindu and the Muslim communities from their provincial homelands and the emergence of the baffling problems of rehabilitation of refugees, evacuee's property and others. Even today, the problems remain unresolved.

The political partition of India also inevitably resulted in the vivisection of the Indian economy to the detriment of both the states. Since Pakistan is predominantly agrarian, and the Indian Union has, within its territory, practically all industries, a balanced

development of their respective economies has become extremely difficult. "The division cut across economic and political links, divorced mutually inter-dependent agricultural and industrial area, cut indiscriminately across railway and irrigation systems and thus placed barrier in the way of All-India economic development and planning of vital importance for the future prosperity of India". Further it has also led to almost chronic trade and currency war between the two states.

The problem of the settlement of refugees also put a great strain on the weak economies of these states.

The unhappy political relations between the two states engendered political suspicion and fear prompting both of them to maintain huge military machines. The Indian Union is at present spending about 54 per cent of its annual revenue on defence. The state of Pakistan too spends an enormous sum on the military. This exerts a severe strain on the economies of both states constraining them to almost starve social services and makes difficult to realize projects of economic and cultural advance.

The Partition also generated political problems like that of dispute over Kashmir and others which are still not resolved. In fact, actually both states were for some time engaged in large scale military operations in Kashmir. The dispute over the Kashmir problem which was subsequently referred to the U.N.O. still remains unresolved. The Partition has also created the problems of border incidents, boundaries as well as others.

SECTION THREE

NATIONALISM AFTER INDEPENDENCE

A

A GREAT PARADOX

PARTY OF UNITY VIVISECTS INDIA

THE post-World War II period, as surveyed earlier, has been crowded with momentous developments in the life of mankind. The achievement of independence by a number of colonial and semi-colonial countries resulted in the elimination of three mighty imperialisms (British, French and Dutch) from a large area of the globe. Further, powerful national liberation struggles of subject peoples have been continuing in those countries (Algeria, Malaya, countries of Africa and others) which are still not free from the imperialist yoke. These developments have tremendous historical significance. The countries which secured freedom were confronted with a multitude of new and complex problems arising out of the new historical situation in addition to a number of unresolved old problems. Many of the problems were common to all countries though some of them were characteristic of particular countries only. Further, even common problems bore similarities in some aspects while dissimilarities in others as a result of a different and unique past development of each country as well as due to the specific manner in which imperialist powers withdrew from different countries. Nay, there existed different post-independence national situations in those countries determined by differing positions of different classes and groups comprising the societies of those now free countries. This divergence was reflected also in the diversified ideologies of the political parties which were at the helm of the nationalist movement in those countries at the time of the transfer of power.

We have attempted to portray the development of Nationalism in India upto the end of the Second World War and, further, upto the historic moment when Britain withdrew from India, transferring power to the Indian people. We also observed how the transfer

was consummated on the basis of the division of India on communal lines. We have also described how the Indian National Congress—the Party, which headed the nationalist movement—bartered away the unity of India and accepted the creation of two states, the state of the Indian Union and that of Pakistan, as the price for the British withdrawal from the country.

POLITICAL ENIGMA

This act of the Indian National Congress, its assent to the vivisection of India and the Indian nation, presents an astounding paradox since for decades it had declared itself as the uncompromising exponent and the representative of Indian Nationalism, had resolutely stood for the unity of India, had claimed that the Indian Nation was an organic whole and had symbolized this idea in the form of India conceived and deified as Mother and glorified as such in its national anthem "Vande Mataram". It, within a short time, renounced this fundamental conception and agreed to the Partition of India in return for the British withdrawal from India. The Party which was the staunch protagonist of United India and a single Indian Nation itself played an active role in accomplishing the reactionary division.

It is necessary to probe into this paradoxical phenomena and locate the causes which prompted the Indian National Congress to act in flagrant contradiction of its most cherished fundamental credo. This astoundingly paradoxical behaviour of the classic national party has confronted historiographers with a veritable political enigma. It raises the problem of the deepest underlying motives determining the behaviour of political parties and the classes the basic interests of which the former serve.

SOME CRUCIAL QUESTIONS BEFORE HISTORIANS

We will first try to formulate the crucial questions which this paradoxical phenomenon gives rise to. These are as follows:

- (1) What motives prompted the Indian National Congress to act in contradiction to its original—seemingly immutable—stand?
- (2) What circumstances forced it to take such a contradictory stand?
- (3) What classes and social groups were really interested in securing such a truncated form of Independence?

(4) The Indian National Congress which was prepared to participate in war on certain conditions and which had no principled objection to practise violence which war involves, abstained from leading the developing mass struggles in the country such as workers' strikes, peasant struggles, militant middle class actions and, further, rebellions which started breaking out in imperialist armed forces as classically expressed in the R.I.N. Revolt. Why did it not develop and unite all these struggles into a mighty country-wide revolutionary struggle and lead it to overthrow the British rule and achieve independence? Further, why did it not utilize these big movements to counteract the pressure of both the Muslim League and meet the ultimatum of British Imperialism?

(5) How is it that the Indian National Congress did not use even its own techniques of struggle like fasting, individual and mass satyagraha, Civil Disobedience, Non-Cooperation and others to convert the Muslim League to its own goal of a single united independent India or to oppose rather than accept Partition of the country? Why was it that these techniques were never seriously tried to bring pressure on the Muslim League to dissuade it from its decision to secure Pakistan? Why was it never tried to combat the communal menace? Or was it due to the fact that these methods have inherent weaknesses? Was it due to the fact that this so-called unique technique has been nothing but a strategy of generating mass pressure only with a view to compel the opponent to negotiate with the bargaining leadership for securing concessions? Is it basically a technique of compromise? Hence, can it be successfully utilised only under certain circumstances and against only certain types of opponents?

(6) Was Independence a forced gift to the nationalist leadership which British imperialism was compelled to make being placed in a precarious and peculiar historical situation at the end of the War or was it the result of the victory of the Indian National Congress (using its Gandhian technique of pressure) over British imperialism?

If it was the result of the mass movement organised by the Indian National Congress, how is it that Independence was conceded after the movement was withdrawn and after a protracted, tortuous process of negotiations in which the Indian National Congress had to make a somersault with regard to its original stand on India's independence?

(7) Was secular Indian National Congress justified in taking

a decision to vivisect India on communal lines? Did it really resolve the problems for the purpose of which this step was taken?

(8) Has the Partition of India and vivisection of the single Indian nation really solved the major problems of the vast bulk of the Indian people for which they were striving to secure Independence?

STORMY CONTROVERSY

Adequate answer to the above questions are vitally necessary for the proper comprehension of the development of the Nationalist movement in India not only during the period of transfer of power but also its subsequent phases. A correct appraisal of the causes of this paradoxical phenomenon will provide a clue to the understanding of the direction of development of the Indian history and the economic, political, social, and cultural trends that have been generated in post-Independence India.

It is extremely unfortunate that a very pragmatic hush-hush policy has been adopted towards these crucial questions pertaining to recent Indian history by the theoreticians and leaders of the Indian National Congress as well as by most of the scholars and academicians in the country

To the best of my knowledge, no serious discussion, no serious controversy, no deep analysis or critical evaluation has been offered to explain this most amazing sommersault made by the Indian National Congress and its fateful consequences to the country.

A stormy controversy has recently raged over Maulana Azad's posthumous work "India Wins Freedom" in which he has blamed certain individual leaders for forcing the Indian National Congress to accept Partition. Dr. Lohia, controverting this, has blamed, on the other hand, in his articles "Guilty Men of Partition" (published in *Mankind*) another group of leaders. Other writers on the subject have been attributing this disastrous event to the errors of one group of leaders or the other.

MAJOR FALLACIES OF HISTORIANS

It is not possible to critically evaluate the major fallacies underlying the viewpoints from which such theories proceed in a short study like ours. However, we can formulate the major weaknesses of all these viewpoints in one statement. All these theo-

ries do not pose the most significant yardstick to evaluate social, political, economic, and cultural developments viz. the fundamental yardstick of class interest. The absence of class analysis disables these historians to probe deeper into the causes which result into the apparently contradictory behaviour of various political parties and other organizations.

Professor D. D. Kausambi, while evaluating "Discovery of India" by Jawaharlal Nehru, has correctly observed that the historian "could have asked himself one question with the greatest advantage, namely, *cui bono*; what is the class that called for or benefited by a certain change at a certain period in history?"²⁴ This counsel is, by implication, addressed to all historians who do not make the class approach to historical events.

The inability or the absence of desire on the part of historians to examine and evaluate historical developments with this fruitful approach is, I think, the greatest obstacle to the correct understanding of the social phenomena. It is this weakness that has led to more or less superficial explanations of the events of the nationalist movement in India.

As I have postulated throughout this study, Nationalism is a movement of various classes and groups comprising a nation, attempting to remove all economic, political, social and cultural obstacles which impede the realization of their aspirations. It is simultaneously also a movement of classes and groups to fill positive social, economic, political and cultural content in those aspirations. As Rosa Luxemburg has aptly formulated: "National States and Nationalism are empty vessels in which each epoch and the class relations in each particular country pour their particular content."

Further, in this multi-class nationalist movement, the class which is at the helm of the movement will put its own class impress on the movement, fill it with the content of its own class needs and aspirations subordinating those of other classes to its own. As has been shown in the earlier work "Social Background of Indian Nationalism" and further very tersely referred to in the prognosis made in the Epilogue, it was the capitalist class which led and dominated the nationalist movement in India. It accomplished this through its classical class party viz. the Indian National Congress, which launched, shaped and provided ideological, political and programmatic content to the nationalist movement.

HISTORICAL POSITION OF INDIAN BOURGEOISIE

A proper appraisal of the specific historical position, needs and aspirations of the Indian bourgeoisie during the War and post-War period is essential to properly assess the dominant economic, political, social and cultural trends of the nationalist movement in India during this period. Such appraisal is also necessary for comprehending its vicissitudes and the tortuous road it pursued. Then alone, we can comprehend various peculiar strategies and tactics adopted by the Indian National Congress during the various phases of this period. It will also throw decisive light on the puzzling problem why the Congress, the uncompromising exponent of the unity of India, agreed to its Partition. The bourgeois class character of the leadership of the nationalist movement will also explain the particular type of the Constitution and the State which were evolved after Independence, and also the various economic policies and programmes which the Congress Government formulated. Finally, it will enable us to understand why particular cultural trends have been dominating the Indian society.

The crucial questions formulated earlier regarding the apparently paradoxical policies of the Indian National Congress could be satisfactorily answered only on the basis of the postulate that these policies of the Indian National Congress have been and are determined by the needs of the Indian capitalist class as it is historically placed.

We have discussed at length the chief characteristics of Indian capitalism and the capitalist class in the chapters on "Rise of Modern Industries", "Rise of Modern Classes" and others in "Social Background of Indian Nationalism". We will briefly sum up those salient features.

Historically, Indian capitalism did not emerge during the rising phase of capitalism. It emerged belatedly in history, when capitalism as a world social system had already entered the phase of organic decline and decay. It has rested on a weak technical base, has a low organic composition of capital and a very limited market both internal and external as a result of the low purchasing power of the poverty-stricken masses at home and formidable competition abroad.

The Indian capitalist class is considerably interwoven with the semi-feudal landowning class. Indian capitalism has a monopoly structure resting on a financial-speculative rather than a strong

industrial base. Due to this monopoly structure, further founded on the system of the managing agency system, has led to increasing concentration of wealth and control in a very few hands. Due to the peculiar caste structure of the Indian society as also due to the peculiar development of Indian capitalism, the Indian bourgeoisie is largely composed of certain castes and communities belonging to certain regions. This class has also exhibited certain psychological traits due to its peculiar historical origin and development as well as the historical situation in which it has been placed.

Unlike the capitalist classes of the rising period of capitalism, it has been timid and compromising. Afraid of the masses, it dared not organize revolutionary mass movements. "Grumbling at those above and trembling at those below", this class elaborates pragmatic policies of negotiations. While adopting such policies of negotiations and non-violent pressures towards ruling imperialism, it, when in power, has no hesitation to use the coercive apparatus of state against the masses when they threaten the capitalist social system.

All underdeveloped countries suffer from the two-fold evils of insufficiently developed capitalism and the survivals of feudalism in economy, social institutions and culture. India too has suffered from these. The Indian bourgeoisie, however, due to its historical position, is incapable of *fully* resolving the tasks of, what the historians have described, the bourgeois democratic revolution such as complete liquidation of feudalism, organisation of a prosperous national economy, solution of the nationality problem, democratization of the social institution, creation of a modern rationalist culture and others.

We have attempted to show in various chapters comprising the earlier book that the fundamental problems (economic, social and cultural) of the Indian society can be resolved only when the state power is transferred from the hands of the vested interests to the toiling masses and ~~then~~ too on a socialist basis.

Both historical research and the experience of the contemporary life of backward nations reveal that the tasks of the bourgeoisie democratic revolution can be completed only by the socialist transformation of society. As Rupert Emerson has pointed out very tersely, the colonial revolution does not end with the elimination of foreign rulers, but begins with that.²⁵ In fact, the great

25. Rupert Emerson: *Representative Government in South East Asia*

process of what he calls a social revolution begins only after independence wherein the gigantic class battles are fought out. If the bourgeoisie comes to power, it attempts to shape the entire economy, polity, social structure, cultural and ideological life in a manner that is suitable to its needs. This class, by the very logic of its position (living in the modern period of general capitalist decline and further in a backward society) is denied the historical ability of successfully solving the fundamental problems of that society. By its futile policies it only aggravates the social crisis resulting in the sharpening of class and other social conflicts. These policies only accelerate the concentration and centralisation of capital, result in the rapid polarization of classes intensifying the economic and social misery of the broad sections of the masses and the lower middle classes. The situation becomes more and more explosive. With the deepening of the social crisis and the sharpening of social conflicts, the bourgeoisie more and more needs coercive forms of class rule and therefore increasingly abolishes democratic liberties and resorts to dictatorial methods of rule (Burma, Pakistan and others). It also campaigns against rationalist and materialist cultural outlooks and revives old feudal religious-mystical ideologies. It tries to inject reactionary ideas and emotion among the masses to keep the masses docile. It acts up to the exhortation of Voltaire that if there is no God, it is necessary to invent one to keep the masses in check.

The transfer of power by British imperialism to the Indian National Congress, the Party of the Indian bourgeoisie in the Indian Union, and to the Muslim League, the Party of the weak Muslim feudo-capitalist class in Pakistan, confronted these parties of the ruling classes in these respective countries with numerous problems. We will restrict our survey to the developments that have taken place only in the Indian Union since the achievement of independence.

B

TRANSFER OF POWER, A CONSTITUTIONAL DEVICE, NOT A PRODUCT OF POLITICAL REVOLUTION

We will briefly indicate how the trends of developments formulated above have been unfolding in India as a result of the power passing into the hands of the Indian bourgeoisie and

being moulded by its classical party, the Indian National Congress. We will succinctly show how the Indian National Congress, which was the custodian of the destiny of the Indian Union, decided to shape the political, economic, social, and cultural life of the people according to the needs of the historically outmoded bourgeois class whom it represented and, therefore, has been landing the Indian society into deeper and deeper social crises, sharper and sharper social conflicts and more and more explosive situations. The policies adopted by it have only aggravated the contradictions and antagonisms which were lying semi-dormant within the Indian society during the period of the British rule but which developed at an accelerated rate under the bourgeois rule during the post-independence years. This was due to the fact that under the British rule, the presence of a common national enemy considerably held in check the conflicts (class, regional and others) between various sections due to the exigencies of national unity and united struggle for national liberation.

More detailed and exhaustive evidence will be found in the elaborate sequel to "the Social Background of Indian Nationalism" which is under preparation.

We will now very briefly survey the major developments that have been taking place in the Indian society during the post-Independence period, under the leadership of Indian National Congress.

TRANSFER OF POWER, A CONSTITUTIONAL DEVICE, ITS IMPLICATIONS

We will first refer to the political developments.

The Indian National Congress, as we have observed before, did not seize power from the British rulers. It secured power as a transfer of sovereignty from the British Rulers to itself and, that too, on the basis of terms and conditions laid down by the Mountbatten Plan viz. foregoing some areas of British India (the parts what subsequently became the territory of Pakistan); the native states comprising feudal India to decide to which of the states—the Indian Union or Pakistan—they should accede and others. The transfer of power was a constitutional device arrived at by negotiation. It was not the result of a victorious political revolution during the process of which new organs of struggle had emerged and which subsequently became units of a new state structure. In fact, one of the peculiarities of the struggles launched

by the Indian National Congress lay in the fact that its leaders did not concern themselves over such problems as what should be the appropriate structure of the future state of independent India and others.

The Indian National Congress and its leaders, nurtured in the bourgeois liberal philosophy, could not even dream of a state of free India which was different from the bourgeois type of state with a bourgeois parliamentary form of government based primarily on the British pattern. Right from Ranade and Gokhale down to the framers of the Constitution of the Indian Union, one hardly finds any original theoretical conception of a new type of state and administrative machinery adapted to the needs of India, a backward colonial country (further with its own peculiarities) when it emerged as a free sovereign country. The Indian National Congress always desired and strove to secure the transfer of power through negotiation and bargains and utilized mass pressures only to strengthen its negotiating capacity. It, therefore, never evolved organs of struggle which were appropriate for overthrowing imperialism and which after achieving national liberation could serve as organs of power i.e. units of the new state structure of independent India replacing the old state structure and the governmental machinery. As Shri G. L. Mehta puts it, "the transfer of power which took place . . . was in the nature of a Constitutional revolution; it involved no breakdown of government or administration as it happens after a violent upheaval. So far as India is concerned, the transfer of power has in some respects been taking place for over three decades both in legislature and executive branches. There was an administrative machinery, an efficient loyal army, industry and trade, civic bodies and municipal politics and an educated middle class."²⁶

C

EMERGENCE OF A BOURGEOIS WELFARE STATE

MAIN FEATURES OF THE STATE STRUCTURE OF INDEPENDENT INDIA

The Indian National Congress, through a Constituent Assembly which was not created on the basis of universal adult franchise,

26. P.W. Thayer (Ed.): *Nationalism and Progress in free Asia*, p. 109

evolved a Constitution. The following were the main provisions of this Constitution:

(1) The state of the Indian Union was to be a secular state.

(2) The state was to be a federal state with a strong Centre. The state of the Indian Union has in fact a number of features which were outlined in the Government of India Act of 1935 enacted by the British Government for evolving a federal state of India. The constituent regional units of the state of the Indian Union were finally to be based on the linguistic principle subject to administrative and economic exigencies.

(3) The Constitution formulated its conception of a good society expressed in the preamble, fundamental rights and directive principles which it laid down.

(4) It enunciated the principle of equality of all citizens irrespective of caste, community, race or sex.

(5) It provided for civil liberties to the citizens but the clauses providing civil liberties were couched in such phrases and conditioned by such ifs and limits attached to them that the state had ultimate powers to curtail civil liberties and even suspend the Constitution.

(6) It provided for certain exceptional powers to the executive at various levels and vested decisive powers in the hands of the President to be used in case of emergency.

(7) It retained the inherited administrative machinery which British imperialism had created for maintaining its domination over the Indian people. Such features of it as the combination of both executive and judicial powers at the lower district levels, which were violently criticized by the Indian National Congress during the period of the British rule, were retained in the main even after independence. The separation of the judiciary and the executive at lower levels is still not accomplished. The administrative machinery taken over from the British period has not been in the main, democratized.

(8) It laid down the basic law for evolving a state and governmental structure based on parliamentary democratic institutions.

(9) It guaranteed to the citizen property rights as a fundamental right but not the right to work.

A BOURGEOIS STATE

The Constitution by guaranteeing bourgeois property rights acquir-

ed the decisive character of a bourgeois Constitution. And the state elaborated in harmony with this basic principle, of the Constitution logically became a bourgeois state.

As Prof. Laski states, "Any state, therefore, in which the instruments of property are in private hands is, by that fact, biased in its incidence. It may state the rights it confers in universal terms, it confines their effective enjoyment to the owners of the property. Its claim to obedience, in the light of this, is the actual power to enforce it apart—a power wholly devoid of moral foundations—clearly a function of its ability to persuade its members that their lot is better under such a regime than it would be under some alternative. That ability, I have argued, will always depend upon the capacity of the state to satisfy the demands that it encounters".²⁷

SIGNIFICANCE OF EMPHASISING THE CLASS CHARACTER OF THE STATE

We raise the problem of the class character of the state because this crucial problem generally has not commanded the attention it deserves among political thinkers in our country. No appreciable endeavour has been made to study and evaluate the class nature of the state of the Indian Union. No serious controversial discussion has taken place to examine, for instance, the problem why the Indian National Congress, which has always glorified the dignity of labour, the morality of "Shrama", still declared the right to property as fundamental and not the right to work in the Constitution which it framed after Independence. In fact, in a country where unemployment, rural and urban, run into tens of millions, the incorporation of the right to work in the Constitution is a vital necessity. Guaranteeing work (which is the very condition of physical survival) is the basic interest of the propertiless citizens and hence primary duty of a state claiming to be the representative of people. On the other hand, by guaranteeing the right to property it becomes the defender of the basic interest of the propertied minority. A state which does not guarantee the right to work forfeits its claim to be called a representative of propertiless classes *ab-initio*. It, by its postulates, becomes the representative of the propertied classes, in India basically of the capitalist class.

27. H.J. Laski: *The State in Theory and Practice*, p. 211

PROF. LASKI'S PROFOUND OBSERVATIONS

Prof. Laski's emphasis on the need of assessing the class character of the state should be seriously pondered over. Generally, this aspect of the study of the institution of the state is hardly paid adequate attention. About state, Laski remarks: "The state, we argue, is not above classes. It does not transcend particular interests and lead to the expression of the total good of society. It is not a way of moving towards the fulfilment of the desires of its citizens. It does not seek to realise the rights they must claim in order to maintain the full dignity of their capacity as moral beings. It does not maintain law and order simply as the atmosphere vital to the maximum satisfaction of demand. It does not legitimate the force it employs by devoting that force to the service of a Community regarded as a body of men and women with an equal claim to what common good imperfect human beings may hope to achieve.

"What, then, on this view, is the state? It is supreme coercive power used to protect the consequences inherent in the postulates of any given society. . . . If the postulates of the state are capitalist it must logically follow that the state will protect the consequences that a capitalist system requires. This does not mean that the state will protect a theoretical conception of capitalism worked out in thinkers' laboratory. It merely means that the state will protect ideas of social good which capitalists put forward as necessary inferences in a society in which theirs is the dominating interest to be satisfied; in a capitalist society, therefore, the power of the state will be coextensive with the capitalist ideas of social good. There may be dissent from these ideas, but the only way in which the dissent can become the major principles of social action is by the transformation of the capitalist basis of the Society. And since that basis is maintained by the state, if necessary by the use of armed force, it follows that the state must be captured by dissent if it wishes to transform the basis of society".²⁸ And further,

"It is this fact which makes it so significant in modern state that its armed forces should be responsible to the government alone. For once their loyalty to the government can be assumed, it is largely, though not wholly, in a position to enforce upon the general body of citizens any decision it may choose to make. The facts that, under modern conditions, the general population is both unarmed and without the means normally to arm itself on the scale

28. Ibid. p. 204-205

that state can do, place dissent from the decision of the State always upon defensive; that is why all modern revolutions depend for their success upon the attitude of the army. That is why, also, it is so significant that, in the capitalist state, positions of authority in the army always belong, in overwhelming proportions, to the members of the capitalist class; the ideological outlook of those members is, normally, a guarantee of their loyalty to the government they serve. . . . The separation of coercive authority in society from the mass of population is essential to the maintenance of law and order there once an unequal interest in the results of the property-system has to be secured".²⁰

We have discussed elaborately this problem and quoted at length from Prof. Laski because theoreticians and academicians in our country have hardly examined the nature of the state of the Indian Union from this crucial angle. There have been extensive discussions about the secondary features of the constitutional machinery. There have been even criticisms of some lacuna in the structure of the constitution or of the governmental machinery by political thinkers and leaders of political parties, but the fundamental problem of the specific class character of the state of the Indian Union has hardly been discussed. The full and far-reaching implication of guaranteeing bourgeois property right as a fundamental right and relegating of the assurance of employment (gainful occupation), of the right to work to a secondary position of a mere non-justifiable directive principle has not been fully examined. It has great significance for the very fate of capitalist democracy in a country like India where capitalist economy is weak and underdeveloped due to the twofold reasons viz. its belated arrival in history and obstructed growth due to imperialist domination till very recent time.

A BOURGEOIS WELFARE STATE

(10) Further, the Constitution by guaranteeing property rights reinforced subsequently by laying down (only as directives) principles for the amelioration of the conditions of the common people has built up the basis for constructing not merely a bourgeois state but a bourgeois welfare state, what Laski calls a Social Service State. This signifies two things, viz. (1) that the state is no longer to become a mere police state performing the negative function

of maintaining law and order but (2) it also will undertake to perform the positive function of providing social services to society by actively participating in the various domains of social life.

TWO ALTERNATIVES

This raises two problems. Will the state be able to provide sufficient social services to the mass of citizens within the matrix of the capitalist economic structure so as to eliminate those evils which result from the workings of the capitalist mode of production? Secondly, having raised the hopes among the masses, who are more and more pressing their just social and economic demands, demands which could be satisfied only by revolutionising the very motif and the mode of production based on capitalist private property and wage labour, the capitalist social service state is confronted with almost an insoluble problem. Either it will have to curtail social services in the absence of sufficient financial resources and, confronted by resultant aggressive struggles of the poverty-stricken people, will have to steadily curtail democracy and move in the direction of its transformation into a dictatorship of the fascist or military type, or it will have to alter the Constitution by bringing about a revolution in the very economic foundations of the existing society, a revolution in the very property relations of the society.

Can a state which is evolved to perpetuate and stabilize the capitalist system and which has elaborated its governmental structure of legislatures, executives, and judiciary as well as army and police to safeguard the present economic system based on capitalist property relations become the instrument of abolishing that system itself? Or will it choose to eliminate the democratic frills and steadily transform itself into a dictatorship?

The following profound observation of Prof. Laski deserves careful consideration:

"Here it is sufficient to point out that the problem of capitalist democracy can—save in the dubious event of economic recovery—only be solved either by the suppression of capitalism or by the suppression of democracy. The first means, the communal instead of private ownership of means of production; and inherent in that transformation, a change first in the class relationships and thereby, in all other relations in society. It would mean a revolution in our way of living comparable in profundity to the changes of the

sixteenth century, or to those induced by the breakdown of the aristocracy at the end of the eighteenth. The suppression of democracy would involve no such fundamental changes in class relations".³⁰

LESSONS OF CONTEMPORARY HISTORY

We have raised this discussion to focus attention on the following significant facts: (1) A positive welfare state is not a supra-class state; (2) A state based on the principle of representative institutions and universal franchise is also not a supra-class or an umpire state when a society is based on private ownership of means of production and has a resultant class structure; (3) The tendency to idealize capitalist democracy as a model, or as the only appropriate form of the state and governmental structure is historically unjustifiable and is unconsciously a rationalization of the desire to justify the bourgeois class state; (4) The claim that a positive welfare state based on universal franchise and representative institutions is a sufficiently effective instrument to counteract and even eliminate the evils born of the capitalist social system is unwarranted and is not supported by historical experience.

It will be instructive to study the history of capitalist democracies during the last few decades, both in West European and other advanced capitalist countries as well as in the colonial capitalist countries which have in recent times shaken off imperialist domination and become independent.

The instances of Germany, Italy, Spain and recently France under De Gaulle, have clearly indicated how easily a capitalist democracy is transformed into an open dictatorship when the bourgeoisie feels that democratic forms of their class rule are an obstacle to their basic interests in a certain historical situation.

The quick transformation advancing in the growing number of countries, which evolved democratic forms after securing independence in varying degrees, into military dictatorial regimes, as also increased curtailment of democratic liberties in almost all undeveloped countries where direct military rule has not been established, also prove the same truth. The ruling classes find democratic frills incompatible with the smooth functioning and sometimes even the existence of the existing exploitative social system.

The growing decline of civil liberties and also the increasing

30. Ibid. p. 203

inroads of the state executive on democratic freedoms of the people even in such classical bourgeois democratic countries as England and the U.S.A. also reveal the same reality.'

ACTUAL FUNCTIONS OF THE BOURGEOIS WELFARE STATE

The positive active intervention of the capitalist state in the domains of economic and social life of the people free the capitalist class from the burden involved in programmes of ameliorative measures which being economically weak it now cannot afford. The state also gives active financial support to the capitalists and formulates taxation policies favourable to them. It further creates the state-owned public sector of the national economy (the state capitalist sector) which basically assists, complements or buttresses the private sector. It also devises disciplinary measures to prevent the workers and employees from launching strike and other forms of struggle against intensified capitalist exploitation (compulsory arbitration and other machinery, Trade Disputes Acts further limiting the freedom to strike and others). Thus capitalist welfare states basically protect the interests of the capitalist class.

Thus we find that a unique development takes place in capitalist democracies during the declining phase of capitalism. In some countries, the state increasingly discards democratic forms and assumes dictatorial forms to preserve capitalist relationships. In other countries, it takes up the role of a positive social service state and actively intervenes to regulate the functioning of the capitalist system with a view to prevent its dislocation and even breakdown which would result from the extreme concentration and accumulation of capital in the hands of a few monopolists and consequent polarization of classes.

As Prof. Laski, Prof. Saville and a number of eminent political thinkers have shown, the negative bourgeois police state which restricts its activity only to the maintenance of law and order by being changed into the social service or welfare state does not thereby cease to be a class state of the bourgeoisie. This transformation only indicates the changed demands of the capitalist class from its state, changed due to the transformation of laissez-faire capitalism into monopoly capitalism.

BASIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE CONGRESS GOVERNMENT

The state structure evolved by the Indian National Congress,

through a Constituent Assembly which was formed on the basis of a narrow electorate, is a bourgeois democratic welfare state and it has been confronted with the same basic problems which the capitalist state is facing in other parts of the world.

The economic, political, social and cultural policies adopted by the Government of the Indian Union headed by the Indian National Congress and the reactions of various sections of the Indian people to these in the form of diverse movements, constitute the content of the national movement in India.

We will now briefly allude to the major policies adopted by the Indian National Congress and put into operation by the Congress Government during the post-independence period.

D

POLITICAL TRENDS

POLITICAL TASKS

In the political field, the Congress government was confronted with the following major problems:

- (a) Absorption of the feudal states.
- (b) Reconstitution of regional state units.
- (c) Elimination of the foreign pockets.
- (d) Creation of suitable traditions and conventions as well as detailed working out of the pattern of the governmental machinery such as would ensure law and order when it started implementing its various plans of industrial expansion and agrarian reconstruction. It had to devise methods and techniques (conciliation and arbitration machinery for labour disputes, and others) so that the discontent of various sections which had to bear the burden of these Plans may not lead to actions which would interfere with the smooth carrying out of the Plans. This became particularly necessary since all sections of the Indian people harboured a hope, even a conviction that Independence would solve all their problems and would lift them up to the plane of a higher economic and social existence.
- (e) Establishing India's position and influence in the international political sphere as a newly emerged free and sovereign power.

ABSORPTION OF FEUDAL STATES: STRATEGY AND CAUSES OF ITS SUCCESS

The Indian National Congress, having secured political power tackled the problem of absorbing the feudal states adroitly and firmly. A detailed picture of the elimination of the states and incorporation of their territories in the Indian Union has been given by Shri V. P. Menon in his book, "Integration of Native States". Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel has been recognised as the main architect of the strategy to achieve that objective.

The strategy was worked out by the following methods :

(1) Negotiations with the princely rulers of somewhat bigger states to make them agree to the integration giving them baits of large salaries and purses; (2) Invoking threats of States' people's movements which were already sharpening and were predominantly led by congress leaders; and (3) By Direct Police Action in some cases like Hyderabad where the feudal autocrat was not amenable.

This task was accomplished with relative ease due to a number of reasons. (1) Indian feudal princes had lost their militancy after 1857 and were duly perpetuated by the British government for its own strategic reason as a social support to its rule. (2) A very large number of states were petty principalities having very small territory and population. (3) The territories of these states were interlinked with the British Indian territory and, economically and in other ways, were developing under the impact of and in close *liaison* with the latter. (4) The big states were closely following the model of the British administrative, taxation and general economic patterns and had therefore already created a climate for an easy fusion with British India. The trading classes, the intelligentsia, the professional classes as well as other groups in the native states were considerably interlinked or even fused with their counterparts in British India. (5) A number of these princes themselves were getting bourgeoisified having made vast investments in Indian industries. (6) As a result of the general oppressive atmosphere as well as due to the impact of the nationalist movement in British India, powerful state's peoples' movements, predominantly led by the Indian National Congress, had also been built up. (7) Indian princes were militarily very weak. Their armed forces were more in the nature of 'show pieces,' when compared with the powerful military machine of the Indian Union.

All these factors combined with the economic bait of liberal salaries and princely purses and the pressure technique adopted by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel resulted into the elimination of the feudal states from the Indian scene.

UNDESIRABLE FEATURES OF THE STRATEGY AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

However, the elimination of the states brought about through the policy of negotiation and bargain between the princes and the government of the Indian Union and not by means of the plebiscites of the peoples of the state had some undesirable consequences. (1) It created the problem of Kashmir which looms large on the Indian political scene. (2) It left vast hoards of money running into crores in the hands of the princes, which could have been taken possession of by the Indian Union and utilized as capital for financing its Plans of economic development of the country. (3) It absorbed a considerable number of the members of this feudal nobility into higher echelons of the governmental machinery, thus injecting into it traditionally orthodox and reactionary elements.

RAMA RAJYA WITHOUT RAMA

However, the abolition of the feudal states, which constituted a reactionary social force and which was artificially perpetuated by the British for political strategic reasons, was a progressive measure resulting in a uniform political pattern of India.

The Indian National Congress, representing the bourgeois class, gave a burial to the centuries old monarchist feudal order and thereby ushered in a new era of the non-monarchist bourgeois republican political order in India. History is full of ironies. The Indian National Congress which built up its movements with the declared objective of establishing Ram Rajya, became the liquidator of the decadent relics of that princely-monarchic order of which Rama was considered the doyen during its progressive phase.

THORNY PROBLEM OF NATIONALITIES

The problem of evolving appropriate units of the Federal Indian Union has proved a thorny one. It raised a number of issues: (1) Redistribution of the territories of old provinces which existed

during the British period and carving out of new state units. This involved disputes over border zones; (2) Fusion of the territories of the newly integrated feudal states into appropriate neighbouring states of the Indian Union; (3) Creation of the constituent state units of such size that they are economically feasible and administratively manageable; (4) The structure and the functioning of the state unit must be such that the vast mass of the people could grasp the administrative processes, ventilate their grievances, and could take active interest and even participate in its activities. This made the adoption of the regional language known to the masses as the language of administration and the government indispensable to them; (5) The state unit had to be composed of such organs of government and such procedures of rule had to be evolved as would assure the control, criticism and observation of the state functioning by the citizens; (6) The state unit should be so organised that the bureaucratic irresponsible administration becomes responsible and responsive to the will and the wishes of the people; (7) The reorganization of state units should provide against their uneven and lop-sided development. It must lead to the uniform development of all units.

This implied a qualitatively new type of reconstruction of the constituent states. It involved a new type of territorial redistribution based on nationality and linguistic principles, also on the safeguarding of equal opportunities of development to each unit. Nay, it signified that the Indian Union was to become a cluster of equally flourishing nationalities having a common economic structure but variegated culture-patterns, that it would be a free, voluntary, cooperative union of various nationalities that constituted the single Indian nation, and, finally, that it would maintain its unity and cohesion on the basis of a voluntary recognition of the basic common interest and bond by those nationalities.

We have discussed in detail the problems of nationalities in the chapter on Nationalities and National Minorities in the "Social Background of Indian Nationalism". We have shown there how these problems could be fully and correctly solved only if first, the power was transferred not to the Indian vested interests but to the working people and secondly, only when the national economy was not geared for the profits of the few who own the means of production but was based on the social ownership of the means of production and universal planning, and, further, functioned for the satisfaction of the needs of the people.

EMPIRICAL APPROACH OF THE CONGRESS

The Indian National Congress during the pre-Independence period had proclaimed the reorganisation of the provinces on the linguistic basis. However, after Independence, it did not, of its own accord, provide for the reconstitution of the states on this basis in the Constitution. This unleashed a series of struggles of various nationality groups for that demand. The struggle for linguistic provinces in multi-lingual provinces was further complicated by various other struggles in those provinces such as competitive struggles among the capitalists belonging to different linguistic groups for economic domination and middle classes for seats, posts, and jobs. Further, the masses of the multi-lingual states desired unilingual states so that they could actively participate in and influence the administration. The Indian National Congress instead of evolving a clear cut principled approach to the problem adopted an empirical, short-sighted policy regarding it. It conceded the demand in Andhra only when a stormy mass struggle erupted and under the pressure of the death due to fast undertaken by an outstanding protagonist of the unilingual Andhra state. Regarding the problem of nationalities, there was a divergence of views within the Congress itself. The Congress Central Government instituted after great delay a State Reorganization Commission to investigate this crucial problem. During the tour of the Commission undertaken to find out the demands of various linguistic units, intense belligerent passions were roused. This, however, brought to light various specific grievances of the linguistic groups and, further, resulted into a spate of memorandas reflecting divergent and conflicting views among various sections of the people. Dissatisfaction against the economic, political, social, and cultural policies of the government also found expression in this movement. The issues of the distribution of jobs and seats, economic development of areas, educational facilities, share in the benefits of social welfare schemes, the medium of instruction and that of administration, and others came to the forefront under the blanket designation of the linguistic movement. The struggle over these issues still persists and has found its classical expression in the Samyukta Maharashtra and Mahagujarat Movements in the huge, unwieldy bilingual Bombay State. It also finds expression in the struggles over border territory.

It should, however, be recognised that the plan for the reorgani-

zation of states as followed by the Parliament has been on the whole on linguistic basis. But the problem of nationalities is not exhausted by the mere creation of linguistic states. It also means providing facilities to each nationality to fully develop its own potentialities. It means providing full economic and social opportunities to the broad masses of that nationality. It means creating adequate conditions (mass literacy and mass education, free and rich development of the regional language and others) for them to be able to freely participate in developing the distinct culture and cultural life of that nationality. But this implies ability on the part of the ruling bourgeoisie and its Congress Government to so plan its resources that it facilitates, along with the development of the whole country, also the development of each nationality area. As we have observed, the Indian bourgeoisie, placed as it is, cannot fulfil this mission. It has neither the resources nor strength to perform this historic task. The inadequate measures adopted to tackle the nationality problem by the Congress Government is decisive evidence of this inability.

FOREIGN POCKETS

Regarding "foreign pockets" comprising the French and Portuguese colonies, the Congress Government adopted a policy of negotiation backed up with agitation to increase the power of negotiations. French imperialism de facto handed over to the Indian Union parts of India which it had annexed in the past and ruled over. Portuguese imperialism has, however, refused to withdraw from Goa and other territory of India and has been suppressing all movements of liberation organized by the people of Portuguese India or by the people of the Indian Union from without. Pursuing a peaceful policy of negotiation and persuasion, the Congress Government has abstained from forcibly recovering this territory, nay even debarred the people of India which organised and launched the liberation of Goa movement from capturing it by their own action. This policy and attitude of the Congress Government to the Goa problem has created dissatisfaction among the people.

The problem of the Portuguese pockets in India remains still unresolved. In fact the present policy of the Indian government is determined by its total foreign policy (Panchshila) in the context of the existing world situation dominated by the cold war between Big powers and the fear of a global nuclear war. Pandit

Nehru has repeatedly remarked that all international problems should be resolved peacefully and through negotiation.

PROBLEMS OF ADMINISTRATION

The Congress in power was faced with the task of evolving traditions and conventions suitable for and in harmony with the functioning of the democratic state structure which it had evolved. It had also to work out an administrative machinery which would effectively maintain law and order in the context of a rapidly changing economy, changing according to the postulates of a mixed-economy and on the basis of capitalist and state-capitalist programmes and plans of rapid industrialization of the country and others and which would involve imposition of heavy economic burdens on the masses and would therefore evoke their resistance. The bourgeois state and the national capitalist economy had to be preserved in the context of the growing demands and resultant struggles of the masses who had dreamt for decades that Independence would bring solutions of their fundamental problems such as employment, food, clothing, shelter, education and other minimum amenities of life.

Further by laying down in the Constitution the fundamental rights and directive principles, the Congress in power had kindled hopes among the broad masses that the state would have the character of and function as a social service or welfare state. To assure democracy and social-welfare measures to the poverty-stricken people on the background of a weak national economy and that, too, a capitalist economy with exploitation and profit-making as conditions of its very existence, the Congress created for itself a difficult and contradictory situation. When the state is unable to remove the poverty of the masses by lifting their standards and social welfare measures, the masses, it is the experience of history, start struggles and even challenge the very capitalist economic foundations of society. In this situation, the government requires to curb the struggles to maintain law and order or abolish capitalism. As Professor Laski has observed, the first path is easier and adequate for the capitalist state. It is in tune with its fundamental postulates. The evolution of the Indian state towards greater rigidity and increasing curtailment of civil liberties, we fear, confirms Prof. Laski's view. The Indian state is orienting towards the road of slowly sacrificing democracy to preserve the capitalist foundations of society.

GREATER RIGIDITY AND INCREASING CURTAILMENT DEMOCRATIC PLANNING ?

As we have observed, the Constitution itself had kept sufficient loopholes in the phrasing of the clauses dealing with civil liberties. Further, it had left wide powers to various executive organs and agencies. In addition, the Government of the Indian Union had perpetuated a number of emergency laws like the Preventive Detention Act and others which were the target of attack by the Congress during the British rule. The growing discontent of the people against the rising cost of living, taxation policies of the government, its legislation curtailing civil liberties and democratic rights of the working people (right of strike and others), also against its educational and other policies has been expressed in various types of struggle such as strikes, demonstrations, individual and mass fasts and others. These struggles have been growing at an accelerated rate in recent years. The Congress governments on their part have, to cope with these struggles, resort to such measures as detention, arrests, and imprisonment, the use of Section 144 and others, banning meetings and processions, and lathi-charges and firing in various parts of the country. This reveals the growing tendency of the government to rule by strong hand and increasingly curtail civil liberties. Criticism of this tendency has been advanced both from the Right and the Left. Scepticism has been expressed by some political thinkers regarding even the adequacy of the democracy of the Parliamentary type. Acharya Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan have been, with greater and greater emphasis, advocating the idea of Non-Party Democracy. There are groups which even talk about the advisability of scrapping democracy itself. Some even consider the principles of universal suffrage and periodical elections as of doubtful political value and hint at the necessity of dictatorship as a way out.

Indian people are passing through a critical period. Next decade is fraught with crucial developments. There is a growing tendency towards the steady curtailment of civil liberties, crippling of democracy, even a glimmering of the danger of dictatorial form of rule, mainly from the Right.

FOREIGN POLICY

As we have observed before, the bourgeois Congress government, due to the historical position in which the Indian bourgeoisie is

placed, has throughout the post-Independence period, pursued the policy of manoeuvring between the imperialist and socialist blocs and tried to secure technical, economic, and other aid from both. However, since the capitalist social system prevails in India and the state power rests in the hands of the capitalist class, the basic orientation of its policy is towards the capitalist camp. This is decisively seen from the fact that India is a member of the British Commonwealth, that Nehru and other leaders express their aversion to communism, that they contrapose democracy and communist totalitarianism and that India has more extensive economic and ideological ties with the capitalist countries.

PANCHSHILA

But as the cold war conflict between the Imperialist and the Communist blocs sharpens, the Nehru government has been finding it difficult to balance between the two blocs. The economically and militarily weak Indian bourgeoisie is extremely afraid of a world war. It feels that India like any other nation will not be able to keep out of it and will suffer disastrously. The Nehru Government therefore staunchly stands for Panchshila or the policy of peaceful coexistence. But events like the British aggression against Suez, the revolts and wars in the countries of the Middle East, the Hungarian Revolution, the Chinese aggression against Tibet, periodical exchange of artillery duels between China and Taiwan, establishment of military dictatorships in Pakistan, Burma and other countries, almost weekly wars and revolutions in the countries of Latin America, conflict between the imperialist powers and the Soviet Union over the explosive Berlin issue, the chronic war of national liberation of the Algerian people against France, numerous struggles of the emerging African nations and others—such stormy developments mock at the principle of Panchshila, at the dream of peaceful coexistence between nations and classes. The more vociferously the principle of peaceful coexistence is preached, the more violently it is infringed in practice by belligerent groups in the social world.

The genesis of the violent and turbulent events in the contemporary world lies, as we have observed, in the contradictory world social system itself which gives rise to all kinds of antagonisms and conflicts. Till the social world is divided into nations which dominate and nations which are dominated and classes which

exploit and classes which are exploited, conflicts will break out. Socialism alone can eliminate conflict from the social world by eliminating imperialism and capitalism. But even when these have been superseded by socialism (a society based on the social ownership in the means of production), a bureaucratic caste, due to historical reasons, may emerge and though capitalist oppression would have been abolished, a new type of oppression may emerge giving rise to Poznan riots, the Hungarian Revolution and such other conflicts.

Pandit Nehru very likely received a shock when the British invaded the Suez area and when the Chinese armies marched into Tibet to claim and incorporate Tibet as a part of China and when later on they ruthlessly suppressed the revolt of the Tibetan people for independence. The Chinese leaders were vying with Pandit Nehru in declaring their allegiance to the principle of Panchshila.

Interests determine the practice of nations and classes and not abstract principles like Panchshila. The foreign policy of the Indian Government is also determined by its own self-interests.

E

HISTORIC CHOICE—CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM?

ECONOMIC POLICY OF CONGRESS

In the economic sphere, the Indian National Congress, after coming to power was faced with the task of building a prosperous national economy based on a balance of its industrial and agricultural sectors, also that of creating a strong heavy industry so that the Indian economy could be really an independent economy. This task was a formidable one. Heavy industry, its development being obstructed by Britain in the past, as observed in the book "Social Background of Indian Nationalism" was very feebly developed. The agrarian economy rested on the primitive plough and even the hoe technique, extreme sub-division and fragmentation of land and uneconomic holdings. It further suffered from the admixture of semi-feudal land relations. Agriculture was rapidly declining resulting in the accelerating impoverishment of the rural masses and the polarization of the agrarian population. Due to the insufficient expansion of industry which would incorporate surplus rural population, the overpressure on agriculture had grown intolerable and the problem of unemployment and underemployment

had acquired monstrous proportions. Even the high prices of agricultural products during the war period had benefited only landlords, moneylenders, merchants and a small stratum of the upper section of the peasantry.

SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS

The task of transforming an underdeveloped colonial economy into a prosperous national economy has raised such numerous significant problems as follows:

(1) Can this transformation be brought about within the matrix of capitalism? Or does it require a complete transformation of existing capitalist property relations?

(2) If a prosperous national economy could be built up on the capitalist basis, would it be achieved on the exclusive initiative of private capital with minimum interference from the state or will the state be required to take very active part for this consummation? In the latter case what will be the proportionate roles of the private and public sectors in the development of the total national economy? If the public sector plays a dominant role in this development, will it mean an advance towards socialism? Does the active intervention of the state in the economic sphere and the dominant position of the public sector in the national economy imply the crippling of capitalism? Is capitalism inherently antagonistic to the active intervention and the moulding of the economic life of the nation by the state?

(3) Can an economy developed on the basis of capitalist postulates resolve the fundamental problem of effective market? Can it further resolve the agrarian problem which is the central issue of the predominantly agrarian economy of a backward underdeveloped country?

(4) Can the regulators of the national economy achieve simultaneously the two tasks, viz. (1) acceleration of the process of capital formation and (2) providing minimum subsistence needs of the vast mass of the unemployed and the under-employed people as well as millions of poor peasants, artisans, and lower strata of the middle class who live at below subsistence level?

(5) Who will perform the fundamental and crucial task of augmenting the economic surplus as well as direct it as investment in the industrial field instead of commercial and speculative fields? Who will prevent it from being used up in the domain of con-

sumption? Further, from what sources this economic surplus for investment purpose was to be created?

(6) Further, how was the agrarian crisis to be resolved? It could be resolved only by a mighty industrial leap, a leap which would not only shift the centre of gravity of production from agriculture to industry, but would also create an extensive field for secondary and tertiary occupations and services for absorbing the surplus agrarian population. No amount of effort could really and permanently resolve the profound agrarian crisis unless the surplus population was withdrawn from agriculture and was provided with alternative employment. Further, the agrarian crisis could be resolved only if millions of uneconomic subsistence oriented farms were transformed into economic, efficient and well-equipped productive units of cultivation. This implied a fundamental reshuffling of property relations. It meant a total overhauling of the entire agrarian economic and social relationships. Could these changes be brought about within the matrix of capitalist system of production?

(7) How was the problem of providing minimum subsistence needs of the vast bulk of the people to be solved? Could weak capitalism simultaneously provide profits to the capitalist class as well as provide purchasing power to the vast mass of the people to buy necessities of life in the market? In short, can capitalism in a backward country and that, too, in the declining phase of its total existence, provide employment to the tens of millions of unemployed persons as well as living standards to the working population without catastrophically affecting profits, even wiping them out, which provide the basic motive of capitalist production? Can it assure people food, clothing, shelter, education and other needs and still assure profits to the capitalist class?

In short the Indian National Congress was confronted with two major alternatives.

We have argued throughout in our earlier book "Social Background of Indian Nationalism" our view that the basic economic debacle confronting Indian society can be resolved only if the entire property relations were transformed, only on the basis of complete elimination of capitalist property relations. The elementary needs of the common men could be assured and a harmonious upward development of economy could be achieved only if a structural transformation of the entire existing capitalist economic system—a transformation which ends the very private property

basis of that economy and substitutes in its place social ownership of the means of production—effected. Under such a new socialist economic system the whole productive mechanism will function to produce not for the profits of the few owners but for the satisfaction of the assessed needs of all members of society. Society as a whole will own and administer the productive technique at its disposal, with the satisfaction of the human needs as the sole motif of production.

We have indicated in every chapter of that book how the crucial problems of Indian masses cannot be resolved within the matrix of capitalism. We have also indicated how efforts to resolve the economic problems of the Indian society on the basis of capitalism would hurl the Indian society into further contradictions, into further polarization of classes, and also into such insoluble dilemmas that the entire economic process come to a veritable deadlock.

ECONOMIC DILEMMA BEFORE CONGRESS

The Indian National Congress which came to power was faced with a dilemma. It had, on the one hand, promised peasants and workers, unemployed and underemployed, artisans, and other sections of the middle classes that independence from the foreign rule would end their misery and solve all their problems. Its support from the masses was based on these promises which kindled hopes of a bright human existence in their minds. It even talked of socialism to the masses. On the other hand it was a party which fundamentally stood for capitalist private property. It subscribed to the Gandhian doctrine that the capitalists have a right to their property, though they should in practice behave as trustees of their property, as humanitarian capitalists. After the withdrawal of the British from the country—when power was transferred to it, it had to formulate definite policies to shape the political, economic, social, and cultural destiny of the Indian people. It had to choose between two alternatives. As we have observed, being a party of the bourgeoisie, it could not but choose the capitalist road of development of Indian society and evolve its policies on the basis of capitalist postulates. It declared property rights as fundamental in the Constitution. It decided to use state power for developing a prosperous Indian society on a capitalist basis. Nay, it chose to adopt a determined policy to develop Indian society on the capitalist

foundations even with active intervention, participation and initiative of the state since the Indian bourgeoisie was economically very weak.

THE POLICY OF MIXED ECONOMY

This decision of the Congress was embodied in the two Policy Resolutions of April 1948 and April 1956 of the Congress Government. The major premises of the projected programme of economic development were formulated in these two Resolutions. They clearly state that Indian Economic Development will proceed on the principle of a mixed economy. The adoption of the method of the mixed economy was unavoidable since the Indian bourgeoisie was economically too weak to undertake by itself, without state aid, the development of the Indian economy. The Congress Government attempted to translate this basic policy into action through its First and Second Five Year Plans. It subscribed to this essentially capitalist policy of evolving its pseudo-socialist, i.e. (really capitalist) pattern of economy and society in India.

As Prof. Hanson observes, India is an outstanding example of a country having eclectic or empirical views about the relative virtues of public and private sectors. As he puts it: "India is fully committed to the conception of economic planning but is prepared to allow, and indeed to encourage, private enterprise to develop important sectors of the economy so long as it can be induced or compelled to conform to the national plan and to operate in the public interest. Referring to undertakings under private control, the Prime Minister, Mr. Nehru, said: 'As long as these industries are kept going and are employing many people, we would rather use our resources for developing new projects and employing more people. If these industries are well managed privately, we see no need for nationalisation at any time.' Although the Congress Party is now officially committed to a socialist pattern of economy, this policy implies welfare economics rather than the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange and Mr. Nehru's statement would appear to be as relevant to the government's Second Five Year Plan, now being formulated, as it is to the First".³¹

TWO CONCEPTIONS OF PLANNING

It is necessary to remove some misconceptions about the term Plan-

31. A.H. Hanson (Ed.): *Public Enterprise* p. 400-401

ning that is prevalent in the world of current economic thought. The idea of Plan is closely associated with socialism, as it had its inspiration from the Plans elaborated by the Soviet Union. However now-a-days the concept of Plan has acquired two distinct connotations; one of Capitalist Planning or the regulation introduced in the functioning of the capitalist economic and social system which became inevitable due to a number of historical reasons; the other of Socialist Planning, i.e. Planning based upon a structurally transformed social order founded upon the elimination of the capitalist class, liquidation of profit motive in production, and further, based upon the social ownership of means of production and production for needs.

It must be noted that active participation of the state even in the economic activities including its elaboration of the public sector is now not considered as hostile to the preservation of capitalist society.

PUBLIC SECTOR AND CAPITALISM

In fact, "The public industrial enterprise has become an important and probably an indispensable part of modern life". As Prof. Friedman observes, "Its growth indicates a significant change in economic and social thinking between nineteenth and mid-twentieth century. The theory still prevalent a century ago, that the state was limited to certain supervisory functions, mainly in the field of military and foreign affairs, police and justice, and that it had no business to enter the field of industry, has given way to the recognition that the intervention of the state in these fields is a legitimate and indispensable function of modern government. . . . Its development is due to a variety of motives, pressures and purposes which differ from country to country and from government to government".³²

Even in the classic land of capitalist private property and "free enterprise", the U.S.A., Public Enterprise has already emerged and proliferated. Lilienthal and Marquis classify public enterprises into four groups, viz. (1) Enterprises to aid private business in need of financial or other assistance and to direct its efforts towards fields deemed socially desirable; (2) enterprises in the fields deemed socially essential although not profitable; (3) enterprises in fields where private enterprise is deemed likely to be unsatis-

factory; (4) enterprises incidental to governmental activities of a non-governmental character".³³

As Prof. Hanson remarks, "To-day, the U.S.A. tolerates a range of public enterprise which, although very restricted in comparison with the range found in many other countries, would have been regarded as positively socialistic in 1920's."³⁴ According to him, "Public enterprise, therefore, may not unjustifiably be regarded as filling the interstices of private business".³⁵

In short, the public sector, which means the state's active participation in the national economy, has become indispensable even for preserving the capitalist system in the present epoch of monopoly capitalism, due to such reasons as imperfect competition, need for large capital to maintain old and start new industrial and other economic enterprises due to technological development since private individuals or corporations are often unable to mobilize such capital and others. We will enumerate below the principal reasons why the capitalist state—the committee to manage the affairs of the capitalist system as a whole—has been increasingly intervening to regulate the functioning of the capitalist economy:

(1) Private capital is unable to provide resources for massive investment required for modern highly developed technical equipments for industrial and other enterprises.

(2) Private monopolies require aid from state to be able to successfully compete in the international market where even giant monopolies look puny before still greater oligopolies.

(3) Strategic and military requirements of the state demand heavy and massive military equipments.

(4) State intervention becomes necessary to regulate the intensifying class struggle in favour of propertied classes.

(5) State planning and regulation of the functioning of capitalism has become crucially necessary to maintain the stability of the national economy and, further, to strengthen the competitive power of the national capitalist economy in the international sphere.

PUBLIC SECTOR, A MATTER OF NECESSITY FOR THE CAPITALIST CLASS

If such a situation prevails even in highly developed capitalist

33. Ibid p. 28

34. Ibid p. 29

35. Ibid p. 28

countries like the U.S.A., Great Britain, France, West Germany and others, the active participation and even the leading role of the state in sustaining capitalism has become still more indispensable in countries which are underdeveloped and which have just freed themselves from the colonial status. "In every country of this group, economic development *via* public enterprise is a matter of necessity, not of choice. It is not, for them, a very important question whether existing private enterprises should or should not be nationalized. The primary question is by what means the State, which alone possess the means of mobilizing adequate supplies of capital and of managerial skills, can best undertake the development of those undertakings of industrial, extractive or public utility type, without which "backwardness" cannot be overcome and national independence itself cannot be fully guaranteed. . . . As the Far Eastern observer at Rangoon Seminar put it: 'Nationalization in Great Britain can be conceived as the final stage in a long historical development of industrial organization, whereas in South-East Asia it is the first step—and in some countries intentionally only a temporary one—towards starting an industrial society' ".³⁶

BOURGEOIS PRECURSSORS OF FIVE YEAR PLANS

In fact, the irony of capitalist development in these backward countries lies in the fact that even in its colonial phase, this development took place largely through the active economic activities or under the protective patronage of the state. Even before the government of the Indian Union launched its programme of planned economic development of India and during the British rule also there was a spate of planning proposals and projects both by various spokesmen of Indian propertied classes as well as by the British government. Vishveshwaraia's clarion call for bourgeois planning, the National Planning Committee's Reports prepared under the auspices of the Indian National Congress with Nehru as the President and Prof. K. T. Shah as the Secretary, Reports of the various committees and planning-cum-development departments set up by the British government both at the centre and at provincial levels to elaborate plans both for the war and post-war periods, further Reports on various aspects of the problem of economic development, and, finally, the well-known Bombay Plan popularly known as the Tata-Birla Plan—these were all efforts at planning

36. Ibid p. 400

which were either projected as schemes of development by the bourgeoisie, or were plans which were worked out by the British government for war and post-war exigencies.*

As Prof. Wadia and Prof. Merchant have observed: "Long before the framing of the constitution and as early as 1944, under the Direction of the Central Government, the provinces had prepared plans and schemes selected from them were partly executed. The Central Government, likewise, had commenced work on plans of its own. Among the more important schemes on which work was already started were Damodar Valley Project, the Tungabhadra Project and the Bhakra Dam Projects."³⁷

The Indian bourgeoisie, though it had become comparatively stronger during the war period, was, on the whole, too weak to undertake, without the state aid, such a herculian task as the crucially needed and extensive industrial development of India.

The Congress Government representing the Indian bourgeois class as a whole undertook this formidable task. To accomplish this task, it decided to create an expanding public (state) sector of economy and adopted national functional planning as the method of economic development. It declared its decision of this approach to the task in its industrial Policy statement which it concretized in its First and Second Five Year Plans.

That the Plans inaugurated by the Congress Government are capitalist and not socialist plans requires to be properly grasped for a correct understanding of the subsequent development of the Indian economy and Indian society in general.

F

ECONOMIC TRENDS

The Congress Government, having decided to achieve the economic development of the country on capitalist lines, was confronted with numerous problems, the most difficult, almost disconcerting, being that of raising financial resources for the various Plans it formulated. The problem of resources was more complicated and difficult since it had to be solved in a manner which would strengthen the bourgeoisie and the national capitalist economy.

All industrial, agrarian and financial policies of the Government have been oriented to this basic and formidable task.

37. Prof. P.A. Wadia and K.T. Merchant op. cit. p. 20

38. Ibid p. 572

INDUSTRIAL POLICY OF THE CONGRESS GOVERNMENT

The industrial policy of the government has been as follows:

(1) It has assigned certain types of economic activity to the Public Sector. The development of power production, irrigation, heavy industry, and transport and communication have been undertaken by the Public Sector. In all these domains the public sector did not always replace the private sector but also reinforced it.

(2) It has left most of the consumer goods industries, which were privately owned and constituted a part of the private sector, in private hands. Nay, by its taxation, export and import policies, it has even actively assisted their expansion.

(3) The Government also started a number of financial and other corporations to give financial and other aid to the capitalists.

(4) A number of the units in the Public Sector have been operating through the intermediary of contractors. This has provided a fruitful hunting ground for profits to numerous private parties. A race for securing these contracts has led to an unholy alliance between the state bureaucracy and private capitalist groups resulting in nepotism, corruption, and bribery. Favours have also been shown on the basis of caste and regional affiliations which thereby have been accentuating castism and regionalism in the body politic. The tale of numerous scandalous deals like the Jeep Scandal, the Tractor Scandal, the Ammunition Scandal, Fertilizer Scandal, Mundhra Scandal and a number of others reveals how in a country with a backward economy the liaison between the state officials and the private sector results in large scale corruption, enormous waste of public money and extensive profiteering by the section of capitalists who are assigned the task of fulfilling some items of the programme of the public sector.

(5) The policy of shift from direct taxation to indirect taxation, the deliberate offer to compound taxes which were unpaid or evaded by a considerable number of capitalists, frequent changes in the policies of controls and decontrols of basic commodities, favouritism shown to particular groups of capitalists in the sphere of the issuing of licenses, and the using up of foreign exchange resources by importing those commodities which were required by private sector as well as which catered to the luxury needs of the bourgeoisie, prosperous section of professional classes, higher echelons of bureaucracy and the upper section of the middle class, and such other measures of the Government have resulted only in

benefiting the capitalist class and upper stratum of middle class of the Indian society. This only proves that under capitalism the policies of the government on the whole favour the rich, at the expense of the common man.

(6) By introducing compulsory arbitration and other measures the Government has curtailed the democratic rights of the working class.

(7) While trying to subserve the interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole and its monopoly section in particular the Government has, found it necessary to discipline and curb the activities of some sections of the bourgeoisie who are engaged in non-industrial, speculative and money lending activities. It has evolved devices such as would divert their resources from those fields into the sphere of industrial investment, the basic requirement for the development of the national economy.

(8) Further, the government has been increasingly adopting more and more the policy of depending on foreign capital for financial aid. It has been assuring it more liberal terms. It has been entering into agreements with foreign companies which are highly favourable to the latter. The agreements signed by the government with the Standard Vacuum Company and the Burmah Shell Company reveal how the former has been whittling down its earlier stand regarding terms and making important concessions demanded by those foreign companies.

PLANNING ASSISTS INDIAN BOURGEOISIE

The fact that the Planning has been benefiting only the Indian bourgeoisie and that too basically its monopoly section is borne out by the developments that have taken place within the national economy. The process of the concentration and the centralisation of capital has made rapid advance after independence. The few monopolies have been extending their octopus-like grip over various sectors of the national economy. This tendency has been continuing unabated even after the proclamations of the Socialistic Pattern in India by the Congress Government.

The table on page 84 indicates the trend of profits in certain important industries.

EMINENT ECONOMISTS ON PROFITS OF CAPITALISTS

The given table, as the eminent economists remark, "do not include the huge illegal profits made by many capitalists by the

The following table indicates the trends of profits in certain important industries.

Industrial Profits Index (1939 = 100)

Year	Jute	Cotton	Iron & Steel	Tea	Sugar	Paper	Coal	Cement	All In- dustries
1947	313.2	317.7	86.1	216.3	171.5	167.6	171.8	142.5	191.6
1948	361.2	548.1	96.3	127.9	381.3	257.0	201.0	252.6	259.9
1949	89.3	292.0	116.0	138.4	216.4	316.7	287.2	295.0	181.5
1950	456.9	356.6	134.2	271.2	262.4	479.0	209.2	333.4	246.6
1951	679.1	551.1	157.7	103.9	420.8	604.1	178.4	419.7	310.5
1952	183.4	262.8	162.6	88.8	409.1	566.8	220.4	293.4	190.6
1953	326.2	379.4	179.4	391.4	419.8	512.7	145.5	279.0	261.2
1954	356.4	387.2	222.9	712.3	334.9	666.1	153.0	341.4	314.2

evasion of controls and by black marketing".³⁹ They further throw "considerable light on the enormous profits made by some of the industries in the post-war period", and "such colossal profits show that the capitalistic development in India is going on according to the inexorable laws of capitalism. The exploitation of labour goes on merrily in India. . . . Many industries enjoy the present prosperous position as a result of the sacrifices of the masses. And yet, when one raises the question of minimum wage—not to talk of a living wage standard—or progressive labour legislation, there is a big hue and cry against it and the plea of inability of industry to bear the burden is always put forward. . . . To charge commissions as managing agents, equivalent at times to the total profits, to distribute dividends at rates varying from 15 to 20 to 30 per cent or more and then to urge the plea of what the industry can bear is only possible in a country where public opinion does not exist and where labour is not sufficiently organised."⁴⁰

ECONOMIC RULERS OF INDIAN PEOPLE

The concentration and centralisation of ownership and control progressing at a rapid rate in Indian industries even after independence has been adequately shown by Shri M. M. Mehta in his works "Structure of Indian Industries" and "Combination Movement in India". Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao in his foreword to the "Structure of Indian Industries" while summing up the findings makes the following observations:

"The most interesting contribution Dr. Mehta makes is in his analysis of recent trends in managerial, administrative and financial integration in Indian Industries. He finds that a few Managing Agency Houses exercise overwhelming control over major portion of Industries . . . Dr. Mehta concludes, and quite rightly, that there is an unmistakable tendency for the concentration of ownership and control in a few managing agencies' firms. Among other alarming features that he notices in our recent industrial history are a tendency for the amalgamation and absorption of smaller trusts by bigger trusts as also the mutual amalgamation of big trusts with vast financial and managerial resources. The system of multiple directorship with resulting concentration of industrial power in a few hands is another development of which Dr. Mehta

39. Ibid p. 572

40. Ibid pp. 573-574

wants the reader to take note. Thus about 100 persons hold as many as 1700 directorships of important concerns, 860 of these being held by 30 persons; while of these 30 persons, ten hold between them no less than 400 directorships. Thus says Dr. Mehta 'for all practical purposes a few leading families in India control and guide the industrial destiny of the country. Fresh and young blood seldom find an opportunity to enter the (closely preserved) and (well-organised) industrial oligarchy'. Another feature of our industrial organization to which Dr. Mehta draws attention is the close link that has developed between industrial power and financial power, either through managerial integration or the system of interlocutory directorships. Thus, all the six leading Indian Managing Agency Houses maintain close connection with Banks, Insurance Companies and Investment trusts through the system of interlocutory directorships. Also the practice of inter-investment of funds in companies under the same Managing Agency is widely prevalent both among Indian as well as European Managing Agency Houses".⁴¹

It is interesting to note that the Company Law Reform Act which is to come into operation in 1960 and is designed to check this tendency, though looked upon as an encroachment, leaves sufficient time to reorganise the entire structure of control by the Managing Agents in such a manner as would continue to retain the hold of the same families over the industry by indirect means.

ECONOMIC OLIGARCHS AND NEPOTISM, CORRUPTION

The control of industry, trade, and finance by a few families, belonging to certain castes and further belonging to certain nationalities, has far-reaching implications in terms of employment and economic opportunities. Family, caste, and provincial considerations distort the entire system of personnel selection. Further, the concentration of wealth and the control of the levers of shaping public opinion like the press, the cinema, educational institutions and others being in the hands of a few families give them ample power to buy off a part of professional and other sections of the middle class, kindle competitive struggles on caste, community, and provincial lines among them, provide discriminatory facilities for a select few for specializations in higher arts and skills (scientific, technical, engineering, and general), who are needed to provide

41. Dr. M.M. Mehta: *Structure of Indian Industries*, p. VIII-IX

the personnel for their economic and state apparatus. A systematic analysis of the family, caste, and community backgrounds of the personnels of legislatures, governmental and administrative machinery and even ministries, also of the social reform, educational and cultural institutions on the lines indicated by the pioneering work of Mill's "Power-Elite" in America—will throw illuminating sociological light on the close liaison and sometime even fusion that exist in contemporary India between Big Business, the Government and other agencies which shape the ideological and cultural life of the Indian people. There is sufficient evidence of the rapid growth of these trends.

The social and cultural trends that are developing in India could be understood only in this background.

CLOSER UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN STATE AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

The rapid expansion of the public sector became necessary in the historical situation in which Indian capitalist economy is placed; the adoption of some welfare measures became necessary for assuaging the growing unrest of the people whose conditions have been steadily worsening as a result of the rising cost of living; the stringent steps taken against a few groups of capitalists for resorting to illegal and dishonest practices in their hectic hurry to make profits, practices which would jeopardise the capitalist economy as a whole; large expenditure on the maintenance and development of the military machine of the state required to cope with increasing internal disturbances and threat of aggression from Pakistan; unpredictable and empirical policies adopted by the Congress Government because of the complex and contradictory national situation which it has been confronted with; the hurricane advance of the socialist ideas and movement in the country and the inscribing, on its banner, of the slogan of a socialist pattern of society by the Congress itself—all this created some fear in the mind of the Capitalist class about the role of the private sector. However, this fear has been now allayed giving way to a new feeling of confidence in that class as a result of a proper appraisal of the government's policy regarding the private sector as a result of the more unambiguous pro-capitalist statements of the responsible spokesmen of the Government.

Charles A. Myers very aptly describes this changed climate

while appraising the language and content of the New Industrial Policy:

"The moderate tone and the appreciation of the role that private enterprise would have to play in rapid industrial development was in marked contrast to earlier statements and was greeted with restrained approval by the private sector. This was all the more remarkable, because the attitudes of the business community which find their way into print are typically not balanced appraisals of the actions of government, nor even entirely accurate indicators of the feelings businessmen act upon. But there has been increasing recognition that, for example, additional steel plants are badly needed and the important thing is not who owns them but that they get built promptly. The belief that the public and private sectors supplement and serve each other, and are not antagonistic, may be gaining ground in both business and government thinking. In an analysis of the 1956 Resolution, an American economist working with the Ministry of Commerce and Industry has noted ' . . . with the possible exception of one or two industries dealing with public utilities and national resources, India has abandoned the overall programme to nationalise private industries falling within the public sector'. Government has in no way given up its "socialistic pattern of society", but the emphasis appears to have shifted towards the maximum speed in industrialisation and this means utilizing the private sector to the full. The Indian Government is not willing to spend its limited supply of capital and managerial resources where independent businessmen are doing an adequate job. . . . It is perhaps true that the first and most difficult phase of the adjustment between business groups with a tradition of private enterprise, and a new government dedicated to a socialistic pattern of society, is coming to an end."⁴²

CONFLICTING VIEWS AMONG BOURGEOISIE

While feeling more and more secure, a section of the Indian bourgeoisie is trying to bring pressure on the Government to eliminate what it considers as "financial waste" involved in the expenditure on some welfare measures initiated by the latter to placate a small section of the masses, also to abandon its present foreign policy of manoeuvring between the two power blocs and instead to identify

42. C.A. Myers: *Industrial Relation in India*, p. 48-49 *

India with and join the world capitalist bloc headed by the U.S.A. It also counsels the Government to create greater confidence among the foreign capitalists and capitalist governments so that they may give more financial aid and invest more extensively in India. They also press the Government to refrain from adopting measures which not only are wasteful but are likely to kindle false hopes and resultant moods of frustration among the masses who might then, in desperation, revolt. The conflicts within the cabinet, among the higher circles of the Congress, between the outstanding ex-leaders of the Congress like Shri Rajagopalachari, Ranga and others who have left the Congress and its present leaders who have grouped round Pandit Nehru reveal this trend. Nehru and Rajaji symbolize these two tendencies, the former representing the earlier policy and Rajaji expressing the new trend. Within the Congress and even within the Cabinet itself these two trends are in modified form contesting for hegemony. Pandit Nehru and Morarji Desai seem to be the focal points of these divergent viewpoints though the latter does not fully subscribe to the views of Rajaji.

Whatever difference may exist between the views of the two wings of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois politicians, it is pertinent to realise that both wings are fundamentally wedded to the policy of preserving Capitalism in one form or another, stand for this or that variant of capitalism. The two viewpoints express conflicting conceptions of how to consolidate capitalism in India, and in what structural form.

AGRARIAN POLICY OF THE CONGRESS GOVERNMENT

We have enumerated in the earlier work "Social Background of Indian Nationalism" the principal problems of the agrarian sector of the Indian economy. We have also stressed the point that the agrarian problem is the hub of the problem of the reconstruction of Indian national economy. We have also stated that the agrarian crises can be resolved only, firstly, by accomplishing a total revolution in agrarian property relations; secondly, by creating appropriate economic units of agricultural production; thirdly, by providing facilities to the farmers to improve their techniques of production; fourthly, by assuring a large number of people who are pressing on agriculture without contributing to the production alternative means of occupation in secondary industries or tertiary services; fifthly, by planning the agrarian production in harmony

with the total needs of the community, and others.

We will briefly review the agrarian policy of the Congress Government and its effects on the agrarian and the total national economy. We have attempted to indicate the trend of development by referring to the findings of eminent scholars as well as to the statements of the Government and other committees in our other work "Rural Sociology in India". We will first briefly allude to the principal measures adopted by the Congress Government and then examine their consequences for the agrarian economy and agrarian society as a whole.

GOVERNMENT MEASURES

The measures of the government can be classified into the following categories:

- (a) Measures to extend and improve the extant agriculture.
 - (i) Reclamation of certain lands for cultivation.
 - (ii) Construction of major and minor Irrigation Projects, some of them of multi-purpose nature.
 - (iii) Production of improved seeds, fertilizers, and tools, as well as insecticides.
- (b) Measures to reform land relations.
 - (i) Vesting of the estates of the intermediaries (Zamin-dars, Taluqdars and others) barring certain properties such as home farm lands, homesteads and others on the basis of payment of compensation to the intermediaries.
 - (ii) Placing of limitations on future acquisitions of lands by different classes of people.
 - (iii) Tenancy Reforms designed to reduce rents, give security to the tenants against eviction, and give them also an opportunity to acquire permanent rights over the land by payment of fixed compensation subject to the landlord's right to a certain amount of land for his personal cultivation.
 - (iv) Restrictions on sale and mortgage, letting and sub-letting of lands.
- (c) Measures to protect farmers from the oppression of creditors.
 - (i) Numerous measures to regulate private money-lending.

- (ii) Measures to scale down debts, etc.
- (d) Measures to bring about an all round development of rural areas such as would result in the strengthening of the national economy as a whole.
 - (i) Establishment of Community Development Blocks and National Extension Services.
- (e) Measures for creating new organisations to assist the process of the betterment of the life of the rural people.
 - (i) Establishment of co-operative societies, Vikas Mandals, Gaon or Gram (Village) Panchayats as well as Nyaya Panchayats.
- (f) Measures to assist some of the small-scale and cottage industries in rural areas.

REPERCUSSIONS OF THE MEASURES

No significant measure has been adopted to resolve effectively the crucial problem of mass unemployment in the rural area. Agricultural workers who comprise one third of the agrarian population have not been given land or tolerable living and working conditions on land. As David Mandlebaum points out, "The lowest castes, those who are mainly landless labourers, often gain nothing at all from the irrigation projects and the redistribution of land. They have nothing to begin with, nothing which can be improved, no means of getting a start and so they remain economically as well as socially disadvantaged. The gap between them and other villagers frequently widens than diminishes on account of development projects".⁴³

PROF. GADGIL ON THE "CORE OF AGRARIAN REFORM"

Regarding the "core of agrarian reform" in India, viz., the organization of agricultural production with particular reference to the size and structure of the unit of agricultural production Prof. Gadgil makes very significant observation. According to him the government "appears content to operate with the existing unit of agricultural production and does not propose to change in any radical manner the organization of land management and operation".⁴⁴ Such a change would demand almost a revolution in the

43. *India's Villages* (A collection of article originally published in the *Economic Weekly of Bombay*) p. 15

44. Prof. D.R. Gadgil: *Presidential Address at Allahabad, 1954.*

structure of existing agrarian production relations which the Congress Government expressing basically the interests of the big propertied strata of society cannot bring about. Further, the very fact that it has recently adopted the slogan and the programme of Co-operative Farming thoroughly reveals how the government has itself acknowledged the failure of all its previous measures. However, if we properly scrutinize this slogan we will find that it does not signify any fundamental change in its agrarian policy, viz., of maintaining the class structure of the agrarian society with a certain reshuffling.

CRITIQUE OF LAND REFORMS

Regarding land reforms introduced by the Government, numerous studies have revealed that these reforms have not altered the basic class structure of the rural society but has only transformed a large number of old zamindars into a class of rich landowners of a new type. Though they have helped a few substantial tenants to become peasant proprietors, the vast mass of poor peasants and tenants, who are too poor to pay compensation and buy up the land, have been reduced to the position of unprotected cultivators on land, which in the context of competitive market economy, implies the de facto status of land labourers.

As Prof. Thorner has tersely remarked, "Land reform laws ostensibly passed for the benefit of the underprivileged have not basically altered India's village structure. The small minority of oligarchs have had wit and resources enough to get around these laws in which, in any event, the loopholes were so large as to give them ample manoeuvring ground. By passing themselves off, whether legally or illegally, as tillers and cultivators, the village oligarchs have gone on running India's rural life. Their uninterrupted presence in power means that the forces of the 'depresser' continue to operate strongly in countryside."⁴⁵

The abolition of Zamindari and other legislation affecting property relations in land, as remarked by many observers, suffer from the following defects:

- (1) The definition of "Peasant" or "Cultivator" is sufficiently vague for permitting the proprietors rather than tillers to pose as cultivators in its interpretation when applying the Reforms.

45. Daniel Thorner: *The Agrarian Prospect in India*, p. 79

- (2) There are numerous loopholes which can be taken advantage of by the landowners to retain their proprietary rights.
- (3) Compensation to the intermediaries or landlords whose proprietary rights are to be transferred to the peasants or tenants has to be paid by the peasants or tenants themselves. Thus only rich peasants and tenants—a fraction of them only—having ability to pay compensation can purchase the land. The overwhelming mass of poor peasants and tenants cannot utilize the opportunity provided by the legislation. Further, the legislation has left the large bulk of poor tenants, who cannot purchase the land, wholly unprotected almost reducing them to the de facto status of non-owning toilers of the land thereby swelling the existing vast mass of landless labourers.
- (4) It has generated a climate of legal strife in agrarian areas which hence seethes with disputes and litigation over property rights in land as well as over ejectments of tenants and sub-tenants by the proprietors.

As an eminent historian of the agrarian legislation has acutely remarked, "If India's recent agrarian history demonstrates anything, it is that doing and saying nothing is preferable to taking small steps slowly and timidly. In Indian conditions if you do not totally reject the principle of non-working cultivators, you cannot prevent the village oligarchs from acting as landlords. As soon as you leave the door barely open for property income to non-working proprietors—which you do when you permit land ownership to exist unassociated with labour in the fields—you allow all the evils of concentration of power at the village level to come trotting back in. As long as some peasants are without land or very short of land, they will be at the mercy of those who are allowed to have land without working it. The whole world of organised subterfuge, with which so many villages are replete, will continue unabated."⁴⁶

In short the Congress Government, due to its capitalist outlook, has abstained from adopting the one measure which, though constituting only the first step towards the realisation of the objective, is the indispensable initial measure, viz., transferring land to the actual tillers of the soil. The history of all backward countries shows how without this preliminary but indispensable measure all

other measures adopted for the renovation of agrarian economy and the liquidation of peasant poverty, become futile. The history of agrarian India after Independence also proves the same truth. Nay, we can even further state that, till this step is not taken, there will be no flourishing agriculture or social peace in the agrarian area. Land hunger is the most powerful urge of the peasantry and till this is not satisfied, the peasantry remains perennially discontented and launches struggles for land, spontaneous or organised.

FACILITIES TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF BY SUBSTANTIAL FARMERS

As irrigation facilities, seeds, fertilizers and improved tools are not given gratis to the cultivators but have to be paid for, the advantage of these facilities, as the Community Project Evaluation Report itself points out "is taken mainly by substantial farmers."

Measures adopted by the Government to check the evils of moneylending have hardly borne fruit as amply proved by the Reports of the Rural Credit Survey and other studies. Further, the type of moneylenders, wherever this has occurred, have changed. Substantial farmers or landlords utilizing to their advantage their dominant position in such institutions as Co-operatives and others carry on the same predatory activity which was conducted by former moneylenders but by different methods and under different garb.

VILLAGE ORGANIZATIONS CONTROLLED BY RICHER SECTION

The measures of the Government resulting in the establishment of various institutions to improve the agrarian situation have, it has been reported by almost all observers, strengthened economically and hence socially and politically only the rich sections of the agrarian society. The Community Project Evaluation Report discloses this fact in the following words: "When one considers the pattern of membership in village organizations, be they cooperative societies, vikas mandals, gram panchayats, or nyaya panchayats, one clearly finds that the membership is confined to the larger cultivators and that the smaller cultivators as well as agricultural labourers have practically no stake in the organization of villages."⁴⁷

47. *Evaluation Report on 2nd Years working of Community Projects*, Vol. 1, pp. 139-141

The mammoth Community Development Programme with its Community Projects and Extension Services also have benefited predominantly the rich stratum of the agrarian society.

The Community Development Projects have been studied by various scholars and organizations. Prof. Wilson, Prof. C. Taylor, Prof. Oscar Lewis, Prof. Opler and his team, Prof. Mandlebaum, Prof. Dube, Dr. Chapekar, Dr. Sangave and numerous other scholars have evaluated their impact on the life of the rural people. Programme Evaluation Organizations as well as special Committees have also systematically studied the working of these massive and expensive experiments made to build up a prosperous agriculture and materially and culturally flourishing agrarian communities.

ALARMING TRENDS

All these Reports and Studies made by experts and Government Evaluative Committees and Organizations have brought to light the following alarming results:

- “(a) The advantages of improvements are taken predominantly by substantial farmers.
- (b) The contributions to be made by the village people are felt as very burdensome by the lower sections of the people.
- (c) The organizations emerging in these areas for bringing about rural change are dominated by the upper sections of the rural population, the poorer ones having “no stake in them”.
- (d) The initial enthusiasm born of great hopes in the projects is slowly declining among the lower strata of the population.”⁴⁸

NEW PATTERNS OF TENSIONS AND COLLISIONS

The agrarian policy of the Congress Government has affected the agrarian society in a number of ways. It has crippled some of the old classes like the feudal and semi-feudal zamindars. It has strengthened and consolidated a class of substantial farmers. So far as the poor and middle peasantry, land labourers and other lower layers of the rural population are concerned, the working out of the agrarian policy together with other programmes has not

48. Ibid p. 140-141

only not led to any amelioration of their material conditions but has even resulted in the further deterioration of these conditions.

As shown in one of our earlier studies, "A sharp conflict of interests and a resultant social cleavage are developing in the rural areas as a result of the measures of the government, Central and State. On one side, there are prosperous peasants, landlords, village moneylenders and traders and the richer sections of the rural people. On the other, the middle and small cultivators, the mass of land labourers and ruined non-agrarian population. . . . As observed earlier, social castes and economic classes are closely correlated. As a result of this, the conflicts of classes even take the form of the conflicts of castes. Thus rural areas are seething with new caste tensions, sometimes visible in elections, sometimes in economic struggles, sometimes in the struggles in local organizations. . . . These new patterns of tensions are emerging in the open. The tensions are becoming more widespread."⁴⁹

The changes that are taking place in the agrarian area as a result of the government measures are tending to sharpen the contradictions among various classes comprising the rural society and, in the context of the caste and other institutional background, are steadily engendering tensions, antagonisms, and collisions between them, the full implications of which require to be properly studied for the proper understanding of the direction of development of the Indian society as a whole.

In fact the present trend of development of the agrarian economy clearly indicates that a government wedded to the bourgeois economic theory of mixed economy and profit as the motive force of production cannot successfully solve the fundamental problem of a colonial, background economy viz. its agrarian problem. The agrarian problem just cannot be solved on the basis of this theory. In fact, all vital economic problems viz. those of food, gainsome employment, better standards of life, through increasing of the purchasing power of the people which would thereby give momentum to the growth of light industries, and others have remained unresolved.

GENERAL ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT

The Congress Government has set as its objective the transformation of the backward colonial national economy inherited from the

49. *Transaction of the Third Congress of World Sociological Congress*, Vol. I, p. 276

British period into a prosperous, independent and balanced economy resting on a powerful industrial basis. As stated already, the government has decided to achieve this transformation within the matrix of the postulates of a mixed economy. In carrying out this task the government has been confronted with the following two problems:

- (1) How to create sufficient financial resources for its successive developmental Plans?
- (2) How to create these resources within the framework of the capitalist economy?

The backward colonial Indian economy inherited from the British period *ab initio* had insufficient resources for its speedy expansion. The first and foremost problem confronting the Congress was therefore how to rapidly augment the resources. Again, committed to the capitalist road of development of the national economy, whatever devices they evolve to accomplish this augmentation have to be within the matrix of the capitalist economy. This implies that the process of augmentation has to be brought about in such a manner that first, the capitalist and other propertied classes became economically stronger and, secondly, that these classes were to be permitted to retain this augmented wealth to the extent that they felt sufficient incentive to carry on the process of production.

DOUBLE DRAIN ON COUNTRY'S RESOURCES

Utilization of the Sterling Reserves, deficit financing, and heavy indirect taxation have been some of the internal means by which the Government have secured finance for its industrial and agrarian programmes. However, these three sources have been now reaching the point of exhaustion. The Government has not tapped certain types of reserves consistent with its bourgeois assumptions. The huge hoards of gold of the rich classes, the great wealth accumulated in the hands of the princes, the landlords and the capitalists, the enormous sums of undisclosed and fraudulently concealed profits of industrialists and other wealthy groups, the vast wealth in the hands of religious and other charities and trusts, profits of the foreign capital invested in India, were some of the reserves which could have been annexed for developing production. Compared with the need, these financial resources would have been insufficient but still they would have been of tremendous initial significance. Further, not only the Congress Government did not mobilise these

resources but it also undertook to provide generous salaries to the princes, liberal compensation to the zamindars, and financial aid from the state revenues to the capitalists through various financial corporations created by the state. It even compounded the undisclosed and unpaid tax amounts from a big section of the capitalists. It also helped them by extending large scale protection of their profits by such measures as protective duties on imported goods without guaranteeing cheaper consumers goods.

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING?

No explanation of this double drain on the country's resources is possible except that the Government acted on the basis of capitalist postulates and primarily from the standpoint of the needs of preserving the capitalist economic structure and secondarily only from that of the welfare of the people. It is sometimes argued that the economic Planning initiated by the Congress Government is democratic in character. One feels an irresistible urge to ask what is democratic about an economic system under which a few oligarchic families control the life and destiny of the entire nation while the vast portion of the people live in a state of abject poverty, struggling for bare necessities of life and tens of millions are chronically unemployed. One wonders and queries what kind of democracy is it where the Government, consciously or unconsciously but consistently, protects, and even financially supports the haves while, with equal consistency, elaborates economic measures which press on the have-nots draining them of their meagre resources, which impose heavier and heavier tax burdens on them and result in depressing their living standards more and more. One also is surprised at the quality of democracy under which property rights are considered as fundamental and the right to work incidental.

A paradoxical situation emerges from this method of augmenting resources for financing various Plans of economic development. Since the main burden is imposed on the common people—masses and the middle classes, it results in an alarming decline of their purchasing power thus leading to the shrinkage of internal market so vital for the expansion of consumers' goods industries. Further, it also drains the very source from which financial resources have to be drawn. Only when the incomes of these strata increase, they can make liberal contribution to the financing of the Plans. Thus planning on capitalist lines involves policies which, by progressively

reducing the incomes of the common people through heavy taxation and other means, dries up the very source from which resources are to be raised for financing the Plans. By reducing the purchasing power of the people it prevents the expansion, nay even the maintenance of the existing consumers' goods industries. A crisis envelopes the domain of light industries.

ECONOMIC DILEMMA

Due to an increasingly shrinking internal market, the capitalists are confronted with the situation where they have to face the dilemma viz. Export or Perish.

But the Indian capitalists find it more and more difficult to compete with powerful capitalist rivals of industrially more advanced countries like the U.S.A., Britain, West Germany, Japan and others. The economies of a number of these countries which were crippled during the war period have been renovated during the post-war years. These countries are gradually ousting India from the foreign market. So, even the export outlet for Indian capitalism has been slowly narrowing down.

Heavy industries, both owned by the state or privately, are in a similar quandary. Since, due to the dwindling purchasing power of the mass of people, light industries do not expand or are even in a state of semi-crisis, heavy industries suffer from the decreasing demand of their products (machinery etc.). Consequently, the state increasingly becomes their main purchaser. But the ability of the state to purchase is also restricted by its financial resources which are shrinking as a result of the progressively drying up of the sources from which they are derived. The overwhelming section of the people have reached a stage when they cannot bear any further burdens in the form of indirect taxes.

Due to the cumulative action of all these factors, there has been taking place a lopsided, unsymmetrical development of various sectors of the national economy resulting into functional maladjustments of various parts. The national economy is more and more caught in the grip of structural disequilibrium.

DESPERATE HUNT FOR FOREIGN CAPITAL

This situation has led to a desperate hunt for foreign capital, frenzied approach to various foreign agencies, both state and private,

for financial aid so that the national economy may be saved from a serious *impasse* even a collapse. The numerous trips of Cabinet Ministers to foreign countries to persuade the foreign governments and private corporations as well as hurried visits of the representatives of Big Business like Birlas and others to the U.S.A., Britain, West Germany and other countries to cajole the more powerful financial groups of those advanced capitalist countries, to invest more capital in India decisively prove how the economic policies pursued by the Congress Government as well as private capitalists to develop the national economy on a capitalist basis have hitherto met with signal failure.

Prof. Baran in his thought provoking book "The Political Economy of Growth" has vividly shown how foreign aid has its own unescapable political and economic implications.⁵⁰ When a powerful capitalist country lends economic aid to a weak country, generally it results in the growing political dependence (even subservience) of the latter on the former. Further, foreign investors select such fields for the investment of their capital as would bring maximum profit to them. The criterion they adopt is their own profit interests and not the needs of the free, rapid and harmonious development of the national economy of the country where they invest. This would only tend to result in a lop-sided and unharmonious growth of the national economy of the country which they "aid". We have dealt with this aspect of the phenomenon in the earlier part of the work.

SHARP CONTROVERSY AMONG TWO WINGS OF BOURGEOISIE

The two wings of the bourgeoisie, one headed by Pandit Nehru and the other clustering round "Forum of Free Enterprise", Shri Morarji Desai, and, further, round the newly emerged Swatantra Party, express two divergent viewpoints regarding the attitude to be adopted to the problem of foreign capital aid. The wing led by Pandit Nehru advocates full utilization of the conflict between the two Power Blocs and take economic aid from both the blocs (one headed by the U.S.A. and the other by the U.S.S.R.) though leaning more and more towards the U.S.A. and the countries of the Commonwealth. Such a leaning towards the capitalist countries becomes inevitable since the economic system prevailing in India

50. Refer Prof. Paul Baran: *The Political Economy of Growth*

is capitalist as in those countries. Pandit Nehru, however, is a staunch exponent of the view that India should maintain a neutral stand and pursue its own independent foreign policy. This wing, further, stands for the extension of the public sector and its decisive and predominant role in the development and determination of the character of the national economy. It also is the protagonist of a large scale programme of social welfare measures which, it believes, is, however, imprudent it may look in the light of a weak national economy, is necessary to assuage the growing discontent of the masses.

The other wing stands for an unequivocal alliance with the capitalist power bloc both in the economic and political fields and for providing greater initiative and facilities to the private sector. It is opposed to the increasing predominance of the state capitalist sector (known as the public sector) over the private sector. It is also, in the interests of economy, against the launching of extensive social welfare programmes.

A sharp controversy and conflict are going on between these two wings of the bourgeoisie. This controversy and conflict have been rending the Congress, the All India Congress Committee and the Congress Ministries as well as the national bourgeoisie as a whole into belligerent camps. It should, however, be noted that the two wings referred to above are ultimately only two wings of the same class, the bourgeoisie.

PROF. BALL'S THOUGHTFUL OBSERVATIONS

Further, as observed already, the economic policies of the Congress Government, both industrial and agrarian, are leading Indian economic development more and more into an *impasse*. It is also objectively speaking strengthening the rich at the cost of the poor, thereby accelerating the process of the growth of economic inequality among the people. We will close the discussion of the implications of the economic policies of the Congress Government by referring to the following thoughtful observation by Prof. W. M. Ball.

"However, early in 1948 Congress changed its course. It had already shown singular skill in appeasing conservative forces which might, if alienated, have sabotaged its programme. It had appeased the Princes with handsome pensions, the zamindars with generous compensation. It appeased the Indian Civil Service by guarantee-

ing to carry out its original terms of service. But in each of these cases it was smoothing the way for those whom it was about to deprive of former powers and privileges. The appeasement of the industrialists in 1948 seemed to imply the protection and strengthening of former powers and privileges. The New policy of Congress was expressed in the Government Resolution on Industrial Policy, published on 6th April, 1948. . . . Other actions in the economic field showed that the Government had decided to rely mainly on the traditional incentives of a capitalist economy for the achievement of industrial development. It sought to induce industrialists to increase production by removing controls wherever possible, by allowing prices to rise freely, and by reducing taxes on higher personal incomes and business profits. There was a shift from direct to indirect taxes. . . . At the same time the Government sought to encourage private foreign investment in India by reassuring potential investors that there would be no discrimination against them and that their interests would be safeguarded if the Government should in the future extend the field of nationalised industries. . . . It does mean that the Government's policy, while failing to achieve industrial development, has increased economic inequalities and thereby nourished the discontents of the less fortunate."⁵¹

G

CONSTITUTION OF INDIAN REPUBLIC

ITS SOCIO-CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE

We have delineated the trends of development of the political and economic life of the Indian people in greater detail since changes in economic and political life of a people have a determining influence on their cultural and ideological life. The process of transformation of the Indian society is particularly complicated since it is composed of numerous social groups which are living in various stages of development and inhabit widely differing economic zones. The social, educational, cultural and ideological developments of these diverse social groups and of the Indian people as a whole, during the period under review, have not been studied extensively and in their interconnections. The body of literature dealing with

51. Refer W.N. Ball: *Nationalism and Communism in East Asia*, p. 186

them is comprised of fragmentary studies. However, it does help us to evolve an outline of the total developmental process. We will now briefly discuss these trends.

JURIDICAL REPUDIATION OF HIERARCHIC PAST

The Indian National Congress, through the Constitution of India, enunciated the principle on which the entire social structure was to be recast. It declared that the Indian society would be reconstructed on the basis of the principle of equality of all citizens, irrespective of caste, creed, sex, race and other differences. Thus it juridically repudiated the entire existing structural framework of the Indian society which was founded on the inequality of caste, creed, sex, race and other factors and which had been persisting for centuries. The Indian Constitution of independent India thus laid down a qualitatively different principle on which the Indian society was to be reconstructed. It was an epoch-making event. It aimed at changing the Indian society which was founded on, in Prof. Hobhouse's phrase, the "bond of Authority" based on hierarchy and inequality into one which was to be based on the "bond of citizenship" resting on the principle of equality of all citizens.

By proclaiming the principle of equality, the Constitution lifted all members of the free state of the Indian Union, who were hitherto subjects of a foreign state, to the status of citizens with equal social, political, economic, educational, and cultural rights. It thus inaugurated a new era of equality for the people of the Indian Union.

The Constitution also provided equal and universal adult franchise to the people.

However, a democratic social and cultural atmosphere was vitally necessary and had to be created for the intelligent exercise of this universal adult franchise by the citizens who had been enmeshed for centuries in the coils of the traditional, authoritarian, joint family, caste and other feudal institutions, and, further, the overwhelming majority of whom were poor and illiterate. The government had thus to provide living standards and educational and cultural facilities to the people if the latter were to become really equal citizens. Such was the task confronting the Congress Government.

FORMIDABLE PROBLEMS BEFORE THE CONGRESS
GOVERNMENT

This set before the Government formidable problems, social, educational and cultural. It demanded replacing the old social structure based on the hierarchic principle of social inequality (caste, authorial joint family and others) and altering or removing old forms of social controls like religion, custom and others. These traditional institutions and social controls prevented the juridically granted status of equal citizens from becoming a *de facto* one. This could be achieved only if a new web of social relations, a new category of social institutions, new devices of social control, and also new agencies of social change such as would meet the needs of a rapid and harmonious development of the economic and social life of the Indian people in consonance with the principle of equality of citizens, were created.

The British Government had introduced certain changes in the structure of Indian society. It had to some extent affected old institutions and regulative agencies. As we have observed in the earlier work, by introducing partial and half-hearted reforms, it only made the Indian society hybrid in character, a mosaic of old feudal and modern institutions. This was in contrast to the fact that the British had practically destroyed the feudal social system in their own country replacing it by a completely new modern democratic capitalist social system. Britain did not, however, completely liquidate the existing feudal institutions in India. It often even conserved them. The Indian society thus suffered from twofold evils, those springing from the inherited and still persisting feudal and pre-feudal social institutions, practices and world outlooks as well as those born out of insufficiently developed capitalist society. In other words, India suffered from all the evils which result from the uncompleted bourgeois democratic revolution.

The Indian National Congress has laid down in the Constitution the central principle for the reconstruction of a new social order. As stated earlier, this principle is founded upon the bourgeois democratic postulates. It aims at evolving and consolidating a society based on the fundamental bourgeois economic postulates viz. recognition of capitalist private property in means of production, profit as the central motif of economic production, and competition as the basic dynamic drive for all individual activity. The

Congress has adopted large-scale industrialization, commercialization, mechanization, and monetization of economic processes based on the principle of a capitalist mixed-economy as a lever to build up a materially prosperous and hence socially and culturally developed Indian society and people.

The Congress Government desired to provide living standards and cultural facilities to the masses and to transform the juridical equality of all citizens into their real equality as citizens within the framework of the capitalist social system. This is not possible. It is like chasing a mirage.

EQUALITY AND ACQUISITIVE SOCIETY

To provide genuine equality of opportunities to all citizens in an acquisitive society which is founded on private property in means of production, the profit urge as the motive of production and competition among individuals with unequal resources is not possible. This is evidenced even in the case of highly industrialised and prosperous western capitalist societies. Much more it is impossible to achieve this in a country which is economically under-developed and lacks adequate resources. All plans of the Congress Government regarding measures of social welfare and higher standards of life for the masses have foundered on this rock.

The sharpening disparity between the declarations and achievements of the Congress can be explained only on the basis of the contradiction of good intentions on one hand but meagre resources of a weak capitalist economy on the other. It is not a question of the free will of the individual or a group, nor is it a question of their honesty or dishonesty. The profound mental and emotional pain and frustration which often Pandit Nehru has been obviously suffering from reveals the dichotomy between the desire to provide equal opportunities for material and cultural development to the masses and the inevitable failure to achieve this within the framework of capitalism. History is law-governed. Historically, capitalism has become unreal. In the twentieth century it has become an insuperable obstacle to the free and rapid development of the productive forces. It has created a world-wide economic, social, political and moral crisis, particularly acute in all underdeveloped countries where capitalism is weak and is desperately trying to maintain its very existence. As a number of eminent scholars have observed, the capitalist system has grown almost insane. Capita-

lism as a social system has not only failed to provide, in real life, equal opportunities to citizens, but in crisis as today is, even aggravating the inequality of opportunities. The experience of all underdeveloped countries including India during the post-war period proves the same truth. Nay, the very attempts to provide equal opportunities to all citizens within the matrix of the bourgeois postulates result in achieving the very opposite. Actually, the inequality of opportunities has been aggravated both due to the objective working out of the laws of the capitalist economy as well as the economic policies of the capitalist classes and the capitalist governments in all these countries. The polarization of classes has been rapidly advancing. As we observed, the very policies of the ruling capitalist class which are being devised to preserve and further develop the capitalist economy result in a lop-sided growth of that economy and the aggravation of the misery of the people. These policies only benefit the big monopolists and the upper stratum of the intelligentsia.

In backward countries, the national bourgeoisie can maintain capitalism and their rate of profit only through increasing inroads on the standards of life of the people and at the sacrifice of social services and the education of the masses. To maintain capital in large units and prevent it from being fragmented, the capitalist government is also compelled to deny equal property rights of inheritance to women as it is evidenced in the case of the Hindu Rights to Property Act.

The history of the social development in India during the last twelve years of the Congress rule is a tragic confirmation of this basic truth.

NO SECULAR CIVIL CODE

We will briefly survey these developments. In consonance with the postulates laid down by the Constitution, it was necessary to elaborate a secular Civil Code applicable to all citizens and founded upon the principle of equality of all citizens. The new French state which emerged after the French Revolution elaborated the Code Napoleon which provided the legal basis for the functioning and further development of the new bourgeois social system and was uniformly applicable to all citizens.

The workers' state in Russia which emerged after the October Revolution also elaborated its special uniform social code which

was applicable to all citizens and which provided the legal basis for the functioning and further development of the new social system. Similarly, the new Chinese state which resulted from the Chinese Revolution created its own social code applicable to all citizens.

The Congress Government has not, however, still devised a uniform Civil Code founded upon the principle of equality of all citizens enunciated in the Constitution.

The compromising and hesitant attitude of the government in the matter of the evolving of a uniform and democratic civil code became clearly visible in connection with the Hindu Code Bill which was brought before the Parliament. First, this showed that the government had abandoned the idea of enacting a uniform civil code applicable to all Indian citizens. Secondly, even when the Hindu Code Bill was passed and became an Act, the original Bill was amended with a view to meet the demands of the reactionary elements of the Hindu society and appease them.

While thus the Hindu law of property, marriage, inheritance and succession was reformed, the Government kept unreformed and intact the codes governing other communities (the Muslims, the Christians and others).

Thus the Government, by failing to supersede all old civil codes governing different communities by evolving a uniform civil code governing all citizens, was criticized for half-heartedness, discrimination and even timid concessions to conservative forces.

H

TRENDS IN EDUCATION

The educational measures adopted by the Congress Government and various bodies created by it also reveal a sorry state. They indicate the confusion and empiricism of the sponsors and also the contradiction between their professions and practices.

MAJOR DEFECTS OF EDUCATION DURING BRITISH PERIOD

The education in India, after Independence, assumed a very crucial significance. During the British rule, the vast bulk of the people were kept illiterate. Further, Britain elaborated an educational policy which subserved its own needs of providing a personnel for

its political-administrative apparatus through which it ruled India and for its economic machinery through which it exploited the country. This personnel in words of an Imperialist statesman was to be "Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, in morals, and in intellect." We have discussed at length the problems and policies as well as the extent and drawbacks of Education during the British rule in our chapter on Education in "Social Background of Indian Nationalism". The main defects of the educational policies, as pointed out there, were as follows:

- (1) Serious neglect of mass education.
- (2) Costly character of education.
- (3) Under the cloak of safeguarding the quality and efficiency of education, restricting of the spread of education so that a politically conscious educated middle class may not grow in large number.
- (4) Insufficient expenditure on education.
- (5) Neglect of technical education.
- (6) Education divorced from the actualities of life, also distorted to glorify the British rule and weaken national pride and self-respect.
- (7) Education transmitted through English, a foreign language, to suit the economic, administrative and other needs of the British rulers, thereby retarding the rapid assimilation of modern scientific knowledge by the Indians and creating a chasm between the educated Indian and the masses.
- (8) Non-elaboration of a national language which could replace English for all-India purposes.
- (9) Deliberate discouragement to translate the extensive modern scientific, democratic, rationalist, and nationalist as well as socialist literature published in English, French, German and other European languages into Hindi and other regional languages of India.
- (10) Defective organization of the educational system and also defective methods of education.

EDUCATIONAL TASKS CONFRONTING CONGRESS GOVERNMENT

With the advent of Independence, the Indian National Congress was confronted with the task of eliminating all the above-mentioned

defects in education, the educational system and the educational policy followed during the British rule. This required a totally new educational policy and a new comprehensive plan of education. It demanded a planned, well-thought out correlation of all levels of education, appropriate distribution of resources at various levels, and adequate production of progressive literature in various Indian languages which would embody the rich treasure of the liberal, democratic, rationalist and socialist thought of the modern west and thus make it accessible to the non-English knowing mass of the people thus liberating their minds from reactionary medieval ideologies and crude superstitions as well as from the authoritarian conceptions of social relations. It was also indispensable to develop an all-India language which would replace English and provide a new medium for All-India communications, for an all-national exchange. The Congress was further faced with the task of retaining and assigning a significant place to English as a medium of international exchange as well as for helping the Indian people to assimilate the ever extending and multi-sided scientific knowledge embodied in the protean English literature.

The new education in post-war India had to be secular, also cheap so as to be accessible to the masses. It had, further, to be in conformity with the requirements of a progressive and developing Indian society.

ABSENCE OF RATIONAL PLAN IN EDUCATION

Even after more than a decade after independence, a sound system of education has not been built. The education remains unrealistic and has become more costly. Confusion prevails in the domain of education. This is revealed in the following facts:

(1) Education, the efficient and universal spread of which demanded an All-India plan, is still not a Central subject but is distributed at three levels, the Centre, the state, and local bodies. Further, education should be a fundamental right of the citizen and, therefore, along with rights of employment, food, clothing and shelter, should command a priority to be assured by the state. Democracy with predominantly illiterate and uneducated citizens is not real democracy. The Congress Government has not evolved a scientific and rational pattern of education both in content and the method of organization. The various types of education are still not functionally and ideologically correlated. Great confusion

is rampant in the domain of education at all levels of education in all states. There is no uniformity regarding the courses of education, the number of academic years, medium of instruction in primary, secondary and higher educational institutions, and also the organizational structure of the educational system.

(2) The efforts of numerous Commissions, Conferences and Seminars have not still resulted in the emergence of a definite pattern of cheap, uniform, enlightened and realistic system of education. The domain of education is still bristling with many vital unresolved problems.

EDUCATION STILL A CINDERELLA

(3) The financial allocation by the state to education is still meagre, though compared to the amount spent on education during the British rule, there has been a marked increase. However, compared to the funds allotted to other government departments the sum assigned to the department of education is astonishingly small. For instance, expenditure on the military sector (and that too under a government wedded to non-violence) amounts to half of the total budget. Further, the Government has decided that if necessary finances cannot be found for the projected plan for national development, to preserve "the core of the plan" it would retrench expenditure (which is already meagre) on education and social services.

(4) The Congress Government has not still been able to resolve the problem of the media of instruction at various levels of education. The task was a difficult one but still it could be successfully resolved. The government should have set aside a large sum and engaged outstanding writers, specialists in various subjects, to create a literature on those subjects as well as render translations of the best scientific, technical, sociological, economic, political, philosophical and other works from English into Hindi as well as in various regional languages. This would have provided the common people of India with essential literature embodying modern knowledge and progressive, liberal, democratic, socialist, and other ideological currents of the modern epoch. This would have resulted in the enriching of all Indian languages. They would have thereby sufficiently developed to serve as instruments for communicating to the common people scientific and progressive social thought currents of the modern world. Such a planned drive

to build a massive literature embodying modern knowledge was vitally necessary. Unfortunately, this drive was never undertaken. The cost of implementing such a plan of translations of key books from foreign languages into Indian languages and, further, creation of original literature in the latter languages would not have been very great compared to its very fruitful results, as well as compared to the costs involved in numerous other projects undertaken by the Government such as massive, air conditioned, spectacular Vigyan Bhuvans, Ravindra Bhuvans, Hotels, palatial and imposing Sachivalayas, enormous literature for the government publicity and for the tourists, numerous documentaries and news-reels depicting the tours of ministers, and others.

A vigorous drive to create cheap, scientific, economic, political, sociological, artistic, philosophical and other literature on the lines of such cheap series as the Pelican, Penguin, Home University and others from English into various Indian languages would have not only brought modern scientific, liberal-democratic and socialist culture to the masses but would have created a climate in which Hindi and all regional languages would have been enriched and developed into suitable and easy media of expression and instruction. Unfortunately, even after twelve years, the problem of the All-India Language to replace English is still in a doldrum. Even the constitutional clauses laid down for substituting Hindi in the place of English as the language for the All-India purposes have been frequently changing. Further, Hindi has been to-day developing with a strong sanskritized flavour and also at a faster tempo in some of the states of North India. Hindi literature has a predominantly revivalist, Hindu, pro-Aryan feudal ideological content. This has engendered fear in the mind of various non-Hindi speaking linguistic groups, specially those living in the South Indian States. The cry against what are called "Hindi imperialism", "the U.P. domination over the Centre", "Monopolist position of Hindi speaking groups in the services" is being seriously raised.

DILEMMA IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

A peculiar dilemma has emerged in the field of education. On one hand, the desire to impart higher education in regional languages is prompting some universities to make the regional language as a medium of instruction throughout the various educational tyres. But this creates a handicap for the students belonging to these

universities to compete effectively at various test examinations held for recruiting the personnel for all-India services since English is still the medium of expression at these examinations. In some centres the regional languages are being used as media of instruction for the primary and secondary education, while English has been retained as the medium of instruction at the higher university level. This has created a situation where students having no grounding in English and with meagre literature in vernaculars on various subjects enter university educational centres with no competence to either study through English or express in English. This inevitably results in the deterioration of their ability of expression as well as in lack of mastery over the subjects on their part. This has led to the emergence of a new generation of the educated young, growing in number but weak in expression, and lacking mastery over the subjects they have studied. Thus the standards of educational levels have been deteriorating. Hindi, the alternative national language, is neither able to supplant English nor is being fed by the regional languages. Thus English prolongs its existence in an increasingly deteriorating condition.

The situation in the field of education has become extremely bizarre. A wide variety of experiments to tide over the crisis have been made, but they have, on the whole, only aggravated the problems relating education.

GROWING APPETITE FOR EDUCATION

(4) The demand for education has been growing at an accelerated pace after Independence. The following are the four principal reasons for this:

- (a) Even an ordinary citizen needs a certain minimum education for intelligently participating in the economic and political life of the country which has been growing more and more complex and affecting him more tangibly than before. Further, he is being enmeshed in an increasingly expanding web of legislative enactments which demands that he should be educated enough to understand those laws which intimately affect his life.
- (b) The post-Independence drive for industrialization, by the state as well as private capitalists, has created an acute need for extensive personnel which would efficiently carry out technical, managerial, executive, financial, administrative,

nistrative and other functions. These jobs of a highly skilled nature have been increasing in recent years. These jobs, carrying with them high incomes and social prestige, (though their number even while increasing remains very limited) have a powerful appeal for the middle classes. Though a small number of aspirants would get these jobs still they have a magnetic appeal for a large section of the middle class who, therefore, send their sons and daughters to higher educational institutions.

- (c) In post-Independence India, as a result of the economic and other developments, a large number of persons belonging to the upper stratum of the rural population find it difficult to maintain their families from the income deriving from the land since it has been progressively diminishing. Further, they find that even to retain their superior position in the agrarian area, they should get some members of their family educated and installed in positions of prestige and political power. This upper stratum of the rural society prompted by these reasons send their children to higher educational institutions.
- (d) The rising cost of living makes it difficult for a middle class family to maintain itself on the basis of the income earned by the male head of the family. Hence the wife or the daughter needs to take up a job to supplement the income of the head of the family. Hence more and more women have been taking to education.

The above factors have created a situation for greater demand of education.

However, education, though it has a greater spread, has not expanded to the extent of the growing demand.

SORRY STATE OF EDUCATION

The world of education is in a sorry state in contemporary India. There is overcrowding in educational institutions. Their number is insufficient to cope with the growing demand. Hence, there is an acute struggle for admission. Further, privately owned schools and colleges are strongholds of scandalous profiteering. Corruption and bribery regarding admission or success at examinations are also rife.

Most of the educational institutions lack adequate library and

other facilities. Even caste, regional and such other considerations govern the functioning of a number of them.

Further, education being costly and prolonged, only those who belong to the rich and upper middle classes can take full advantage of it. The various studies undertaken to investigate the caste, vocational and income background of the students taking higher or specialised education, have revealed that these students spring from the upper strata of the Indian society. Thus they monopolise higher education and therefore also higher and lucrative posts in economic, administrative, political, educational and other spheres. Further, those belonging to lower-middle and lower classes who receive a limited education find that there are not enough jobs at lower levels for their growing number. It is true that employment opportunities have increased during the post-Independence period. Still, the number of jobs falls far short of the demand created by even the limited expansion of education. This has resulted in the increasing growth of unemployment among the educated people and resultant discontent among them against the government.

In fact, a situation prevailing during the regime of Lord Curzon during the British period has been reproduced on a more aggravated scale. The same cries for the high quality of education, restriction on the number of students entering higher educational institutions and others are again heard from a number of upper class politicians in contemporary India. Education must be restricted, they say.

Thus a paradoxical situation has arisen. Even before education could reach the mass of the people, cries of warning are being raised against its expansion. This is due to the fear of the educated unemployed. In the projected Plans expenditure on education like that on social services, it is suggested, should be retrenched to preserve the "core" of the Plans. This becomes inevitable when Planning has to be carried out within the framework of capitalist postulates.

PRAGMATIC AND CONTRADICTIONARY EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

The empirical approach and the unpredictable and zigzag policies regarding the problems of education such as methods of education, curricula, and appropriate patterns of degree and post-graduate courses, have been criticized by a number of profound educationists. In fact the world of education to-day is in a semi-crisis.

In addition to this, there are also various types of conflict (caste, regional and others) rampant in educational institutions between university and university, between universities and affiliated colleges, between the government run institutions and privately run institutions. The present generation of Indian students is a martyr to this tragic state of things.

The students are helpless victims of empirical and contradictory experiments, and even factional and venal practices prevailing in a number of educational institutions. A ferment among the students and their resultant struggles have been growing against the rising cost of education which has been making almost impossible for the vast bulk of the people to educate their children, against vagaries about curricula and others.

The dream of an education, cheap and hence accessible to the vast masses of the people, has been receding further and further during the post-Independence years.

(6) Despite its frequent declaration that it will build up a sound system of cheap and scientific education at all levels, the Congress Government has failed in its attempt to achieve this objective. It is not possible for a weak capitalist country to realize this ideal.

I

SOCIAL TRENDS

The Congress has decided, as we have observed, to advance on the road of industrialization, to rapidly develop both industrial and agricultural production and thereby provide higher standards of life to the people.

The actual process of accelerated industrialization involves profound changes in the very structure of society, also changes in the pattern of living of the people. It demands or leads to a considerable modification of the existing institutions, or even total replacement of them by new ones. It also calls for great changes in values of life. The following are some of the problems emerging from industrialization which should be studied.

BOURGEOIS INDUSTRIALIZATION VS. SOCIALIST INDUSTRIALIZATION

What new socio-economic groups have been emerging in the Indian society as a result of industrialization? Which among them have

been making greater sacrifices and which of them reaping benefits? What patterns of institutional and associational life have been emerging and how are they being inter-related? What types of social regulations and controls have been emerging as a result of industrialization? All this depends not only upon "a number of variables such as levels of living in agrarian society, density of population, types of industries established and the speed with which they had to result in greater production, the equity of fiscal system, adequacy of education, the type and lay out of factories and workers' houses, and the nature and strength of the pre-industrial culture",⁵² but also upon the basic postulates, the fundamental philosophy, which underly the method of industrialization.

Unfortunately, there exists to-day meagre literature dealing with the fundamental differences underlying the two theories of industrialization. A systematic discussion on the two principal methods of industrialization viz. (1) Industrialization based on the postulates of socialist planning i.e. based upon the principles of the social ownership of the means of production, production for needs of the community and not for profit, and elimination of competition and substitution of cooperation in economic and other social relations between men; and (2) Industrialization based on the postulates of capitalism i.e. based upon the principles of the private ownership of the means of production, production for profit and competition characterizing economic and other social relations between men, and others, has not still developed on an extensive scale in our country.

The two different methods of industrialization and general economic development engender two qualitatively different modes of social organization. They further determine the direction of the economic development, and, therefore, also determine the nature of the basic urges and motives which govern the actions of individuals. They also determine the patterns of institutions and associations, opportunities and handicaps for different strata of society, distribution of material wealth among those strata as also the character of the entire culture of that society, ethical, philosophic, artistic and other.

We are raising this crucial question at this stage of our discussion because a clear distinction between these two different methods of industrialization has to be drawn, because they gene-

⁵². U.N.O.: *Processes and Problems of Industrialization in underdeveloped countries*, p. 119

rate two qualitatively different types of social, institutional, ideological and cultural patterns in a country. The postulates underlying the industrialization will basically determine the structural pattern of a society as well as the nature of the functional interdependence of its various parts. It will also determine fundamental gestalt of all social relationships.

THE CONGRESS GOVERNMENT CHOOSES CAPITALIST INDUSTRIALIZATION FOR INDIA

The Congress Government has undertaken to industrialize the country on the basis of the postulate of a capitalist mixed economy. This fundamental postulate has been shaping the economic structure of the Indian society which determines the life-patterns and consciousness of various strata comprising the Indian society as well as the institutional, cultural, and ideological life of the Indian people as a whole. This economic structure also provides the basic compulsions and motives of activities of various classes and social groups and determines the pattern of benefits which these classes and groups receive or sacrifices they make.

Capitalist industrialization means industrialization on the basis of profit as the motif of production for those who own the means of production and, secondly, competition as the basic character of all social relations. It means the destruction of social relations and institutions which were founded on traditional feudal and pre-feudal principles such as birth and status, and a subsistence feudal economy. It also means the elimination of that principle of coordination of various parts of the feudal society which, though based on inequality and a hierarchy of ranks, possessed a peculiar harmony of its structure. It means introducing the principle of competition and acquisitive motif in all social relations and institutions thereby destroying the specific forms of mutual aid and communal cooperation which characterized the feudal society, both rural and urban. It also signifies the dissolution of the customary and traditional controls thereby depriving the individual of the satisfaction which he derived from his life lived among traditional primary groupings like joint family, caste and village community, though all these institutions were founded upon a rigid authoritarian and hierarchical basis. It implies the transformation of the society into a gigantic arena of ruthless and universal competitive struggle among individuals comprising the society, (each individual) endeavouring

to succeed in the market.

Capitalist industrialization means transforming the entire old socio-economic structure by such processes as mechanization, commercialization and monetization of the entire economic life of the community, and, further, by introducing competition in all relations between individuals and profit as the central motif guiding the wheels of the locomotive of society.

In advanced West European countries capitalist industrialization "was a cumulative process, spread over many decades, during which the whole social system gradually changed. It was proceeded or accompanied by revolutions in agriculture, commerce, political systems and values, science, art and religion."⁵³ It was further facilitated and accelerated by tremendous accumulation of wealth (which served as capital) from huge colonial super-profits, which also enabled the bourgeoisie to undertake numerous social services, providing some relief and even amenities to the alienated, isolated "lone individual in mass society". But even in those countries, eminent philosophers, social thinkers, and historians have shown how the bourgeois basis of life has been generating rootlessness, atomization of individuals with resultant growth of neurosis and moods of frustration among vast sections of the population who are still rated as commodities in the market and are still dependent for their jobs on the vagaries of the anarchic market. They are not elevated to the status of free citizens assured with economic security. All these thinkers have been pointing out the inadequacy of the basis of the associational and institutional structure elaborated by capitalism to provide basic satisfaction to the vast mass of the people. In the declining phase of capitalism, the social system existing even in advanced capitalist countries has become structurally more defective and more unsatisfactory for providing primary requirements to vast sections of the people and for maintaining the dignity of human existence.

BOURGEOIS INDUSTRIALIZATION—ITS LIMITATIONS

The process of industrialization on the capitalist basis launched in underdeveloped countries generates peculiar evils. First, it only partially dissolves the old associational, institutional and cultural framework and is also unable to provide the population with a new one. As an eminent thinker has remarked, "In contemporary

53. Ibid p. 120

underdeveloped areas where rapid industrial expansion is induced, parallel changes in other sectors and other aspects of natural life may lag far behind and fail to provide a basis for an integrated process of social and economic development".⁵⁴ Capitalist industrialization in a backward country is unable to completely liquidate the old traditional feudal and pre-feudal social institutions and values and is also unable to provide those corresponding to the normally developed capitalist social system as are found in West European capitalist countries. The social norms, the pattern of family and other social institutions, and the psychological traits remain partly feudal and partly modern. The economically weak bourgeoisie as well as the bourgeois state have not sufficient material resources to provide social and cultural amenities which would be a substitute for the loss of the old forms of mutual aid and customary cooperation. The bourgeoisie, also lacking liberal urges, fights shy of evolving new secular and democratic norms and mores as well as new forms of association and social institutions founded upon these norms and mores which would compensate for the old socio-religious norms and mores and old forms of association and social institutions based on the latter such as caste, joint family and village community. In fact, a peculiar contradictory phenomenon emerges in underdeveloped countries. The dominant capitalist class utilizes old institutions, old values, old systems of social control for its own advantage. These old institutions, values and social norms help it to keep their wealth concentrated in small groups, and preserve it in the form of joint family property. They help this class to employ a section of the petty-bourgeois at cheaper rate and assure itself of greater loyalty based on common family, caste, religious, and regional alignments. They make it possible for it to divide the employees on these lines thereby preventing the latter from uniting on class lines. They further assist the propertied class to utilize the prestige, status loyalties, traditional hierarchic authoritarian regulative mores attached to the higher castes to retain their hold and control in the new competitive set up. The more the dislocation of life of the people and uprooting of the old values among them as a result of bourgeois industrialization, the greater becomes the need for the bourgeoisie to hark back to the old values to retain its hold over the people. The Indian scene exemplifies this process in a classical way. Numerous studies dealing with the social impact of bourgeois industrialization confirm these conclu-

54. Ibid p. 120

sions. We will briefly describe this emerging pattern.

SOCIAL TRENDS IN URBAN AREAS

We will first survey the social currents generated by capitalist industrialization in the urban areas.

GROWING DISPARITY BETWEEN EXPANDING INDUSTRIES AND INSUFFICIENT CIVIC AMENITIES

Capital locates those areas for its investment which provide initial facilities. As these facilities are to be found in the already existing urban areas, new enterprises as well as commercial establishments are generally started in cities or in the suburban zones of cities. This further industrial expansion of cities "automatically creates a need for parallel investment in public utilities, roads and means of transport, workers' accommodation, sanitation, schools, hospitals and recreational facilities". As the parallel investment in those domains is made by different agencies—private bodies, local authorities, provincial authorities or central authorities—there is no previously made estimate of capital required in the aggregate. Further, the resources are utilized in an unplanned and lopsided manner. Further, in a backward country, the resources being very limited, investments in public utilities, communications, working class housing, sanitation, schools, hospitals, recreational and cultural amenities, and such other domains lag considerably behind the need. Also a larger part of these investments is made to cater to the needs of the bourgeoisie, the wealthy stratum of the middle class, and the upper section of the bureaucracy.

This inability to expand social services and amenities to cope with the needs arising as a result of the expansion of factories and other establishments and, further, the distortion of the supply of facilities in favour of the upper stratum of the urban community, create numerous social problems. They are as follows:

- (1) It results in the deterioration of the total urban environment.
- (2) It overtakes the common people for the inadequate facilities provided.
- (3) It creates slums for the mass of workers and bad housing conditions for the middle classes.

(4) It depresses the level of living for the majority of the people.

(5) It generates "two-class configuration of urban community", an upper class cultural configuration and a lower class cultural configuration.

UPPER-CLASS CULTURAL CONFIGURATION

(6) It creates a standardized pattern of the upper urban cultural tradition more of a superficial decadent type in almost all cities cast in the image of that of cities in Western countries, with its fashionable hotels, air conditioned cinemas and theatre halls, with its stadiums and recreational centres, with its display markets, with its commercialized art and conspicuous consumption goods, and with its grotesque fashions and night life. Caught in the whirlpool of competition generating a constant sense of insecurity, tossed by caste, regional, and other forces on which they are often dependent for securing and maintaining jobs, isolated from the masses because of their upper caste and higher-income status as well as due to their consciousness of possessing wealth or superior technical, executive, administrative, academic, actuarial, legal, medical or other professional skills, the members of the upper stratum of the urban society elaborate their own distinct status system, its own consumption patterns, its own recreational devices. It utilizes new facilities of the modern times but still conforms to the values of the old culture. At heart they still cling to the feudal and pre-feudal values. Non-secular and oriental in their basic life, they only put on the western gloss. This elite, comprising the upper and upper middle strata, has been elaborating a hybrid culture which is decadently luxuriant, which is modern in form but conservative and status preserving in essence, which is exhibiting itself through a display of glittering apparels made of nylons, sharkskin, decarons and rayons, with their standardized tailored Business, Ambassadorial, Executive, Diplomatic, and other new status-patterned styles for the males and vanity bags, puffs, lip-sticks, long-nails, and ornamental attires for the women on one hand and petty caste, religious and superstitious life and feudal world outlook on the other. Thus an urban upper cultural tradition has been emerging which is predominantly hybrid, sophisticated, isolated from the masses, revivalist in essence, double-faced and basically combining the authoritarian upper class values with upper caste values of both

capitalist and feudal India respectively.

LOWER-CLASS CULTURAL CONFIGURATION

As the primary objective of capitalist industrialization in backward countries is a rapid growth of factories, workshops, and office establishments needed for running industries, pure industrial considerations dominate over other factors in urban development. Inability to provide housing facilities and amenities to the increasing mass of working people (increasing as a result of the expansion of industries and the accompanying paraphernalia) finds physical expression in the growth of barracks systems, factory dormitories and workers' tenements, workshop-sleeping, and street-sleeping and in numerous variants of shanty towns, . . . and native localities".⁵⁵ The growing factories and other establishments require man-power, human commodity. Bourgeois industrial planning gives priorities to profitable production and fundamentally treats human beings as commodities to be evaluated in terms of its cost in production. Provision of facilities and amenities to this army of wageslaves—skilled and unskilled—are decided by the consideration of just making this commodity efficient. It is not dictated by the considerations of the requirements of the workers as human beings. With limited resources and profit requirements in competitive market the bourgeoisie or its state is unable to provide urban amenities and social services to this ever-expanding "amorphous mass of labour". Social and cultural poverty marks the lower cultural traditions in urban areas. Slum life, overcrowding, bad housing, poverty of resources as well as lack of space for recreational activities, create numerous problems the principal among these being as follows:

DISORGANIZATION OF FAMILY, BREAKDOWN OF MORALITY AND INCREASE OF CRIME AND PROSTITUTION

(1) Over-crowding and bad housing lead to the disruption of family life and old satisfactions, without their being substituted by new ones. There also arise disproportion of the sex composition of the population, extensive prostitution (clandestine and open), also a breakdown of morality in the family. Further overcrowding and bad housing also lead to the undermining of old traditional

55. Ibid p. 123

social mores without their being replaced by new ones. This weakens the family and other traditional types of authority and control over individuals and results in the increasing disintegration of social organization itself. It leads to shiftlessness, spread of crime, and delinquency. This gives rise on an aggravating scale to the phenomena of the lumpen-humanity, the decayed elements of the various strata of the population.

(2) Another group of problems also emerges in the urban society. These problems arise from the working conditions and employer-employee relations in industry. The conditions and methods of work are still on the lines of those prevailing in earlier phases of industrialization in England and other western countries. The bourgeoisie cannot afford to be liberal in a backward country though the standards of labour's rights and privileges are laid down by the models provided by those obtaining in advanced countries. This dichotomy leads to disparity between the demands of the workers and their satisfaction. Neither the bourgeoisie nor its state can, on the basis of capitalist planning, provide adequate standards of work and life to the masses. All their efforts to achieve this through various means such as factory and social legislations, social welfare and social educational programmes and others hardly touch the fringe of the problem. A number of studies of the working class conditions of life as well as of the results of various private and government measures to improve these conditions prove this.

MOBILITY DEGENERATES INTO SHIFTLESSNESS

As we have observed, capitalist industrialization in a backward country in the present period results only in the partial disappearance of old social institutions and social norms and the partial growth of new ones. This engenders a contradictory situation in the society, in the economic, social as well as cultural fields. It results in the increasing polarization of classes, with a small stratum of super-wealthy people with a small fringe of upper middle stratum at one pole of society and that of an increasing mass of poverty stricken people at the other pole. In the absence of proper social welfare and social security measures of the modern type (the economically weak bourgeoisie cannot assure these) the poverty-stricken people look to feudal institutions like caste and joint family for aid and desperately cling to them. These

have the tendency to conserve those feudal institutions, nourish feudal emotions and also perpetuate feudal cultural outlooks. The wealthy stratum utilizes these institutions, as we have seen to subserve its own interest.

In short, capitalist industrialization in a backward country, without adequate expansion of social services and educational facilities, is generating a mobility which is tending "to degenerate into shiftlessness".

As we observed, there is a notable lack of the development of a network of social welfare institutions. Whenever such institutions emerge, they have not sufficient financial means to render economic, educational or social aid to the poverty-stricken people. Further, in the general reactionary social climate, they function distortedly. Casteism, communalism and regionalism vitiate their functioning.

In a backward society during the period of drive for industrialization which inevitably results in the considerable break-up of the old institutions, the government is confronted with the problem of creating new institutions to render aid to those sections of the people on whom the burdens of the industrialization process fall during the transition period. But on account of insufficient resources and the bourgeois postulates within which the industrialization is carried out, the government is unable to provide social and economic relief to those sections. This results in the rise of social trends in the urban areas, which we have described above. In India, these social trends are appearing with ruthless logic and give birth to a specific category of movements.

SOCIAL TRENDS IN RURAL AREAS

In the rural sector, the impact of the agricultural development, on a capitalist basis, is equally disastrous. The rapid transformation of the entire agrarian economy from subsistence to a market economy and for the profits of growing sections of agrarian capitalists and rich farmers, is altering the very basis of social life in the countryside. It creates a very unfavourable situation for the owners of uneconomic holdings. We have already referred to the significant economic changes taking place in the agrarian society.

We will briefly outline the major social trends that are emerging as a result of Congress economic policies.

AGRARIAN AREA A BATTLE FIELD OF COMPETING GROUPS

(1) The introduction of the principle of equality of citizens as a political principle and maintenance of a competitive and profit-based capitalist national economy as an economic principle have ushered in gigantic changes in the agrarian society. It has transformed the subsistence oriented cultivators into competitive profit-chasing farmers producing for market. It has thus created a tremendous handicap for those large disadvantaged groups who compete with meagre resources. The economic condition of middle and poor peasants (as well as mass of agricultural labourers and ruined petty-artisans) has worsened as a result of unequal competition with the new capitalist and prosperous farmers in the agrarian area. The competitive struggle is becoming more and more unfavourable to the lower strata of agriculturists as a result of the agrarian policies of the Congress Government which provides such facilities as supplying of seeds, fertilizers, irrigation, credit, marketing opportunities, loans and others only to those who can pay for them or are credit-worthy. This has created an extensive discontent among the agrarian masses and resultant sharpening conflicts among richer sections which become economically and politically strengthened as a result of the various agrarian programmes of the Congress Government and those sections which consequently become weaker and weaker. Enmeshed more and more in the growing network of relations of a competitive market economy, these middle and poor sections are being impoverished and uprooted at an alarming rate.

ACCENTUATION OF CASTE CONFLICTS IN NEW COMPETITIVE SET-UP

(2) Eminent scholars as well as numerous Government Commission Reports have shown that there is a peculiar correlation between caste and economic status. A few upper castes and a few upper layers of intermediate castes occupy higher rungs of the ladder of the economic life in agrarian areas, while the vast bulk of the people belonging to lower castes, depressed and scheduled castes or scheduled tribes, occupy its lower rungs.

The widespread elaboration of the principle of economic, political, social and cultural competition in the agrarian area, has been destroying the harmony of the static, status-oriented, and substance-based community life of the countryside. In India, this prin-

ciple of competition 'manifests itself also as competition between caste and caste. The old status-based caste order was founded upon the principle of each caste accepting its own lot as a part of the divine order. In it every caste became complementary to others forming the total social system. This non-competitive and complementary relationship between the caste constituents of the social system provided cohesion to the system in spite of its hierarchic and non-equalitarian basis. The principle of equality of individual citizens as the basis of post-Independence Indian society is a new principle of social organization unknown to India's past history. But unlike in the West, it has unleashed a new and a peculiar ferment, a ferment wherein the struggle for equality among different castes has also emerged. A specific type of tension has been emerging as a result of the change in the very essence of caste gestalt. Each caste which was a complementary, non-competitive part of a total social structure has been functioning as a competitive unit within the changing set up. This competitive gestalt has coloured every aspect of social life in the agrarian area. It has led to widespread movements of numerous castes to reform themselves, by adopting the practices of the upper castes which are considered hallmarks of those castes. Brahmanic customary rituals like the thread ceremony, Brahmanic mode of marriage, upper caste food and dress habits, upper-caste designations and others are being adopted by the lower castes with a view to elevate themselves to the status of equality with upper castes. Further, numerous sub-castes are fusing themselves to jointly and hence effectively compete with other castes for raising their status in the eyes of other castes. Caste Organization, Caste Charities, Caste Cooperatives, Caste Scholarships, Caste Journals and reinterpretation of the past history by a caste with a view to establish a claim of its superior status in the past and thereby score a point in the struggle for equality with other higher castes—this constitute a part of the social landscape in agrarian India.

Thus ironically the principle of equality of citizens (irrespective of caste and other considerations) as laid down in the Constitution in the context of a competitive capitalist economy—growing more competitive, as a result of the present economic policies of the Government in the peculiar Indian rural society—is giving rise to feudal castes striving for equality.

Further as pointed out there is a peculiar correlation between caste, wealth, economic rank, class position, political power and

accessibility to education and culture. In the environment of a capitalist society based on acquisitive competitive struggle which is being universalized by the Congress Government, through its policy of industrialization there arise economic, political, administrative, social and cultural struggles of peculiar and novel patterns. Brahmin-Maratha-Mahar struggles in Maharashtra, Anti-Brahmin, Adi-Dravid, Dravid Kazagam movements and Brahmin-Nair struggles in South India, the bitter struggles between Kayasthas, Bhumi-hars, Rajputs and backward castes in Bihar, the struggles between Thakurs, Pasis, Chamars and others in the U.P. and numerous such struggles in various parts of the country are basically socio-economic in content and caste in form.

WHITHER LOWER STRATA

The agrarian policy, political-administrative set up and social-cultural measures of the Congress Government generate the following currents in agrarian areas.

(1) Bitter Economic Competition among various classes, which happen also to correspond to definite castes has grown more acute. All production is now being transformed from predominantly subsistence to commodity production. This is making the capitalist landlords and rich farmers richer and the middle and poor peasants poorer. It has resulted in the degeneration of a big number of these strata of peasants into paupers or land-labourers. The polarization of classes is thus advancing. The wealthy classes, the capitalist landlords and rich farmers who constitute also the upper castes are strengthening their hold over the agrarian society due to their increased strength. This development is leading to the following results.

(a) A section of the lower section of the agrarian population is becoming rootless and is taking to criminal activities, which is on increase.

(b) Since the poor agrarian classes are also definite lower castes, they consolidate and strengthen their caste organizations to carry on their struggle for economic, social and political demands.

(c) A movement to organize class organization cutting across caste lines and launch class-struggles against exploiting classes as well as their government is also growing.

WEAK ORGANIZATION OF LOWER STRATA ON CLASS LINES

Owing either to the lack of political and ideological clarity or faulty

opportunistic and pragmatic approaches on the part of the various Left Parties, the organization of the exploited strata on class lines which alone can effectively counteract the first two abovementioned tendencies have not made much progress. Nay, some of the Left parties, having their social roots predominantly in the upper layers of peasantry, often, consciously or unconsciously reflect and serve the interests of those layers and hence frequently in opposition to the interests and movements of such sections as poor peasants and land-labourers, the latter in mass often belonging to the lowest Hindu social castes. They lead multi-class movement in agrarian area but fight shy of developing or even continuing them when under the pressure of lower strata, they tend to grow into gigantic militant class movements.

THE NEW RURAL ELITE

The upper strata of the agrarian society which have been becoming stronger as a result of the functioning of the agrarian policies of the Congress Government constitute the 'New Rural Elite'. They have been capturing positions of power in economic, political, social and cultural fields in the rural area. These strata provide new regional, district and provincial leadership in various fields. They also serve as the powerful support of the Congress in the countryside. They also further provide personnel to various local and district boards, and other rural organizations. They provide the personnel to staff the lower echelons of administrative machinery. They send, as their representatives, a large number to state legislatures and even to the Parliament from rural areas. These strata dominate local, civic activities, school boards, village Panchayats, various religious, caste and tribal bodies. They provide the personnel for various welfare organizations which are emerging in the countryside. They in fact constitute socially, economically, and politically the more powerful class in the agrarian area.

MYRON WEINER'S PREGNANT OBSERVATIONS

Myron Weiner's recent study of "Political Leadership in West Bengal", in which he is trying to examine the composition of 'Intermediate leadership' which serves as a link between 'the social system and the governmental structure' and the main characteristic of which is that 'it has a constituency' not simply an electoral

constituency but 'some group affiliation—a trade union, a peasant, refugee, caste or tribal organization; a business chamber; a civic association' throws great light on the trends which we have referred to above. He observes:

"One striking difference between Communists and Marxists Leftists on the one hand and Congressmen on the other is the extent to which one is deeply involved in various kinds of occupational interests such as unions and peasant associations while the other is more involved in local government, local civic activities, various caste, religious and tribal bodies. Congressmen are active in school boards, village panchayats, charitable organizations, tribal and scheduled caste societies, Muslim associations, temple boards and a host of other bodies in local community. These bodies, public and private, are the structures of power and influence in rural India and it is in these that Congress Party show clearly its voting power in West Bengal. Few Assembly members have built their electoral careers on trade union and peasant organizational work and the fact that so few non-Congress men are elected from outside Calcutta is a demonstration of this fact. . . . All this suggests that class conflicts within rural areas are not so great as to disrupt the unity of local civic bodies. Were economic conflicts within rural areas clearly articulated, then peasant organizations, bodies of agricultural labourers, tenants associations and the like would be growing as sources of power and would provide the base by which politicians could obtain power. This has not happened in West Bengal and the Congress Party with its commitment to harmonizing divergent interests profits from rural unity . . . In recent years, there have been indications that these parties (Communist and Marxist Leftists) intend to imitate the Congress by working within local bodies, credit societies, cooperatives and village panchayats." And further, "rural leadership is derived from community associations which unite the community, not class associations. . . . Intermediary landholders, large peasants, and non-agricultural middle classes are sources of local leadership. Poorer tenants and share croppers might oppose the leadership, but have yet to show any disposition to do so."⁵⁶

These in brief are the trends at work in the agrarian area. The tensions are mounting and the entire rural world is seething with deep discontent among the lower strata which in the absence

of their class organizations does not find expression in their organized class movements, but becomes manifest in semi-organized political and economic movements, in anarchic spontaneous actions and sometimes frequent and growing criminal outbursts.

Absence of adequate class organizations and united struggles on class lines of those exploited classes and uprooted tribals only help the upper caste and propertied sections of the society who utilizes to the full the present economic policies of the Government to their advantage as well as astutely make use of the old feudal institutions and feudal divisions among the exploited classes to prevent their unity and united movements of the agrarian masses. Nay these upper sections go further and exploit the discontent of the lower strata for their own factional and other rivalries as well as for their own agitation against government by canalising this discontent into numerous movements oriented to these aims.

We have now completed our survey of social trends both in urban and agrarian areas that are developing in India after Independence.

In both agrarian and urban areas, the economic policies of the Government as well as its social welfare measures (which have to be carried out within the matrix of capitalism) benefit primarily the upper strata, at the expense of the lower strata. The poverty of the masses and the middle classes has been aggravating resulting in the intensifying of tensions and conflicts. Now and then explosive situations develop and sharp struggles, organized or spontaneous and anarchic flare up.

A NEW AND DEEPER SOCIAL CRISIS

Indian society after twelve years of Independence under the Capitalist Congress rule is heading towards a new and deeper crisis. Food situation is becoming acute. Prices are continuing to rise. The peoples' standards are falling. Unemployment is on the upgrade.

Hopes harboured and dreams dreamt by the mass of people about independence are being steadily shattered. This is due to the fact that the people (minus the microscopic fraction of capitalist, wealthy upper stratum of professional classes, an upper stratum of the bureaucracy and some other few groups) find that not only their standards of living are not rising but are even falling from year to year. They inevitably attribute this to the poli-

cies of the Congress Government which is in command of the state. As we have often observed, the policies of the Congress Government fail to achieve the amelioration of the conditions of the people since these policies are based on the postulates of a capitalist economy and endeavour to accomplish that objective within the framework of capitalist system which, in the given historical situation, is not possible of achievement.

The debacle is reflected in the increasing weakening and growing splits within the Congress.

J

IDEOLOGICAL TRENDS

We will next refer very briefly to the main ideological currents which have been developing during the post-war years in our country.

The history of all societies shows that the dominant culture of a society is the culture of the dominant class, the class that is in command of the economic and social life of that society.

The bourgeoisie is the dominant class in India since the Indian society is based on a capitalist economy. The dominant culture in our country is therefore the culture of the dominant capitalist class.

Normally a capitalist class in its rising phase develops a scientific, rationalist, materialist culture. Thus the rising capitalist classes of England, France and other West European countries declared war on the feudal religious culture. Their intelligentsia comprising such intellectual giants as Bacon, Locke, Hume and others in England and Decartes, Holbach, Helvetius, Diderot and others in France crusaded against religio-mystical philosophies of the feudal society and laid the foundation of rationalist and materialist philosophies.

As we have previously stated the Indian bourgeoisie due to its peculiar origin, belated arrival and weak historical position, never oriented or elaborated thoroughgoing secular, rationalist or materialist philosophies either during the British or the post-Independence period. We will explain the main reasons for this more explicitly.

Indian capitalism did not develop in the process of a heroic struggle against Indian feudalism including feudal religion, its spiritual support. Indian capitalism was a byproduct of British

Imperialist capitalism. Hence for its all-sided growth, Indian capitalism did not need to dislodge existing feudal and pre-feudal philosophies.

Indian capitalism was born during the declining phase of world capitalism when, due to the general crisis of capitalism even in advanced capitalist countries the ruling bourgeoisie, not cognizant of the cause of the crisis, have been increasingly abandoning rationalism and materialist philosophies and retrograding to religious-mystical world outlooks. Much more does the Indian capitalist class faced with the debacle of their weak capitalist economy and discontent of the masses whom it cannot assure primary necessities of life need to orient towards idealistic and reactionary feudal religious philosophies.

IDEALIST AND RELIGIO-REVIVALIST TRENDS

It is not accidental that, barring Pandit Nehru, almost all forefront political and ideological leaders and ex-leaders of the Congress, past and present such as Mahatma Gandhi, Rajagopalachari, C. R. Das, Rajendra Prasad, Patel brothers, and others have been staunch adherents of religious and idealistic philosophies. The bourgeois intelligentsia of India—bourgeois because they have believed in the capitalist foundations of Indian society—in the given historical situation of Indian capitalism cannot feel rationalist and materialist urges. Nay as the problems of the crisis of the capitalist system become more complicated and unresolvable they orient towards religious and mystical world outlooks with greater hurry.

We will just briefly survey how this is manifested in the main ideological trends during the post-war period.

Though the Indian bourgeoisie built up a fundamentally secular bourgeois democratic state, which has been imparting modern scientific, technological and liberal democratic education, this class and its intelligentsia have been, in the cultural field, revivalist and more and more popularizing, supporting and spreading old religious and idealistic philosophic concepts among the people. We will give some illustrations:

SOME MANIFESTATIONS

- (1) After national liberation, independent India was renamed as Bharat in tune with the old Hindu tradition.

(2) Their revivalism is revealed in their effort to evolve Hindi, the all-India language, with an emphasis on Sanskritized flavour, even to the extent of eliminating any aroma of Muslim culture. Their discarding of the term Hindustani for Hindi also points to the same bias.

(3) It is also shown in their selections of national symbols (Dharma Chakra and others) and their drive to resurrect certain cultural values of the pre-Muslim past.

(4) It is strikingly manifest in the cultural revival that is being organized, directly or indirectly, under the state patronage overwhelmingly emphasising the old Hindu and other pre-Muslim traditions. Large scale popularization of religious and superstitious ridden festivals (Ramlila and other), melas (Kumbha and others), and other programmes actively sympathized by eminent leaders of a secular state or outstanding leaders of the party in power also indicate this revivalist Hindu religious under-current in the conscious or subconscious mind of the leaders.

(5) Efforts to organize sadhu samaj and link it with Bharat Sevak Sangh and thereby make use of the most orthodox and most consciously conservative section of the Hindu society as an agent of moral and social transformation and that too under the active guidance of the topmost leaders of the Congress reveal how the party of the bourgeois and its state are utilizing old religious leadership to buttress its position against the growing discontent of the people.

(6) Recent exhortations of eminent and responsible ministers belonging to the Congress Party to introduce teaching of religion in educational institutions and particularly to inoculate school children with religious superstition indicate the same trend.

(7) The organized efforts of a number of ministers, ex-ministers, governors, ex-governors and other Congress or ex-Congress leaders as well as those of leaders belonging to Gandhian Sarvodaya movement to start institutions, academies, cultural centres, publication series, art and aesthetic associations, to emphasise values founded on revivalism also tell the same story.

(8) The ritual of only broadcasting Bhajans and devotional songs in the early morning programmes of the Radio generating helpless moods of dependence on mystical power also indicates the same trend.

(9) Active and vigorous participation by a large number of leaders of the Indian National Congress into communal, caste, and

Hindu-revivalist movements and also recast numerous traditions in religious mould also provide further evidence of this trend.

(10) The recent "back to vedic and Gita" approach of Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Jaya Prakash Narayan and other leaders the avowed idealistic and religious outlooks of Rajendra Prasad, Radhakrishnan, Rajagopalachari and other outstanding leaders, and the very recent advice to Congressmen even by Pandit Nehru, the most secular of the leaders of the Indian National Congress to evolve a basic approach to Indian problems on vedantic ideals, demonstrate how idealistic and religio-revivalist trends are being inculcated to shape the ideological and cultural content of the Indian intellectual "renaissance". The Indian bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia, in consonance with but in a cruder way, have been elaborating similar trends which are developing in all capitalist countries. The scientific outlook, causality, progress, optimism, and secularism in its positive sense are being discredited. Opportunist pragmatism backed by a philosophical idealistic or religious theological world outlook is spreading its reactionary influence to befog the reality, to conceal an outmoded capitalist social system as the genetic cause of the crisis of world society.

The idealistic and religio-mystical philosophies of the ruling bourgeois class further reinforced by crude mythological culture rampant among the masses constitute the dominant culture of the Indian people today. The social role played by this culture is reactionary since it gives a myopic picture of the physical universe and the social world, a misexplanation of the fundamental causes of the economic and social crisis, opiates the consciousness of the masses and tries to divert the latter from advancing on the road of scientific solutions of their problems.

Contraposed to this dominant culture, there have been developing in the country minor rationalist and materialist ideological currents. Marxist materialism and Radical Humanism founded by M. N. Roy are principal among these. They have, however, extremely limited but growing influence among the people.

K

POLITICAL PARTIES

We will next refer to other political parties which have been functioning in the country along with the Congress, the party of

the bourgeoisie.

The original Congress Socialist Party which was founded in 1934 and worked within the Congress, subsequently split from the latter under the impact of historical political developments. The Socialist Party as it called itself after the split subscribed to the ideology of social democracy with its objective of a socialist society in India to be established by the peaceful method of an electoral victory resulting in the capturing of a parliamentary majority and the establishment of a socialist government. The party afterwards united with the dissident Congress group led by Acharya Kripalani and the new Praja Socialist Party was formed. The party has a programme of mobilizing the masses and the middle classes in trade unions, peasant association and employees' organizations on the basis of their immediate economic demands as well as for the ultimate socialist objective. The party organizes struggles of these classes with the final objective of achieving an electoral victory, capture a majority in the Parliament, form a socialist government and replace capitalism by socialism.

One peculiar fact has to be noted. In West European countries social democratic parties (Labour Party in Britain and others) developed in the prosperous phase of capitalism. They gathered strength because by launching struggles they could secure significant standards of life and other reforms from the capitalist class which had resources in the form of superprofits of colonial exploitation to buy off the discontent of the masses and the middle classes. In contrast to this, Indian capitalism is economically too weak to make concessions to these classes. Hence the class struggle becomes progressively more bitter in India. The Praja Socialist Party, with its social democratic ideological and psychological make up, is unable to give adequate lead to the masses and the middle classes. Further, under the impact of sharpening economic and political crisis, an appreciable section of the Praja Socialist Party has under the leadership of Dr. R. M. Lohia subsequently broken away from it and formed a separate Socialist Party of India.

To-day the Praja Socialist Party is socially based on the lower layers of the capitalist class which are threatened by the powerful capitalist monopolies, the upper and upper-middle strata of the middle classes and sections of working class. Fissiparous tendencies are growing within this party. Ideological confusion and organizational crisis is spreading within the Party as the class conflicts sharpen in the country.

The Socialist Party led by Dr. Lohia, we may observe, is socially based mainly on the lower middle class, both urban and rural, and middle layers of agrarian population. Hence it displays greater militancy and fighting zeal than the parent Praja Socialist Party from which it split. Ideologically it is confused and like Praja Socialist Party attempts to synthesise Gandhism which was the classical ideology of the national bourgeoisie and socialism which is the ideology of the working class.

Both these parties reject Marxism.

The Communist Party of India has a broad mass base and constitutes the principal Opposition in the Parliament. Like all Communist Parties in the world it derives its line not from the objective conditions in the country in which it functions but from the exigencies of the foreign policy of the Soviet government at a given moment. This has led it to make frequent shifts in its policies unwarranted by any real change in the national situation. For instance, during the phase when Ranadive was at the helm of the Party, the Party characterized the Indian Revolution to be carried out as Socialist. But since then and to-day it describes it as anti-feudal and anti-imperialist and not socialist. During the former phase it evaluated the entire Indian bourgeoisie as reactionary while in the present phase it considers the national bourgeoisie i.e. that (mythical?) section of the Indian bourgeoisie not alligned to the imperialist bourgeoisie as progressive. During the former phase, it stood for and pushed the policy of class struggle to the point of adventurist insurrection in Telangana. During the current phase, it has been practising the policy of class collaboration, "critically" supporting the capitalist Five Year Plans and declares its agreement (in its Amritsar Congress Thesis) with the social democratic theory of peaceful bourgeois parliamentary democratic transition from capitalism to socialism.

These constant zigzags of policies have done great political damage to the Communist Party. It has recently suffered a very severe defeat in Kerala a veritable Waterloo where it alienated and evoked the hostility of practically the entire population.

There are, in addition, other parties, functioning in the country such as the Revolutionary Socialist Party, Forward Bloc, a number of Workers and Peasant Parties, Jan Sangh, the recently formed Swatantra Party sponsored under the leadership of Rajagopalachari and others. New parties on provincial level have been also emerging in the arena of politics. This is due to the sharpening crisis

in the country. Awakened castes and socio-economic groups form their own parties reflecting their specific interests. The old well-established parties like the Congress have been experiencing political and organizational crisis in varying degrees.

All this ferment and advancing process of disintegration are the consequence of growing unstable political disequilibrium in the country resulting from the intensifying economic crisis and class struggle.

L

THE CENTRAL IDEA

We have now completed a succinct survey of the development of Indian Nationalism during the intra-war and post-war period.

The survey has been extremely brief and has been adapted to the exigencies of the limited space provided by the Postscript. We have just discussed the economic, political, social, educational and cultural developments which the Indians experienced during this period. We have referred only to the principal trends of this developmental process.

The central idea underlying our evaluation of developmental process of the Indian society during these years has been that the weak capitalist Indian society, during the period of the general decline of world capitalism (of which it is a part) as a social system, cannot resolve the economic, political, social, educational and cultural problems arising from its current crisis.

This means within the matrix of capitalist social relations, on the basis of capitalist property relations, a prosperous industry, a flourishing agriculture, a scientific and artistic culture, cannot be created.

The present crisis of the Indian society, with episodic zigzags, will only further deepen, resulting in the aggravation of economic disequilibrium, political instability, and social, moral, and cultural degeneration.

Much as we dislike to make such a prognosis, the actual process of development (or decline) of the Indian society from year to year unfolds such a gloomy perspective.

Under capitalism it is not possible to liquidate mass poverty, mass unemployment, mass illiteracy and mass ignorance. It is not possible to completely destroy the reactionary caste and other inhe-

rited feudal institutions. Capitalism in crisis only strengthens social and cultural reaction.

The tasks of what is known as the bourgeois-democratic revolution such as building up a prosperous economy, recasting of feudal institutions in a democratic mould, full blossoming of civil liberties, and replacement of obscurantist feudal idealistic, religio-mystical and crude mythological culture by a scientific rationalist culture cannot be accomplished by the historically weak Indian bourgeoisie living in a backward country and during the period of the general crisis of the world capitalist system.

Only socialism can end the present crisis of the Indian society. It alone can carry out the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution as well as further advance the Indian people on the road of a still higher socialist material and cultural existence.

Power in the hands of the toiling masses and materialized in a socialist state of the working class based on higher socialist liberty of the individual and inscribing in its Constitution 'Right to Work' and not 'Right to Private Property in means of production' as the fundamental right is the indispensable precondition for a historically higher transformation of the Indian society.

Such is the central idea underlying the discussion both in the earlier work "Social Background to Indian Nationalism" and this work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AGARWAL S. N.: *Gandhian Plan of Economic Development*, 1944.
 ALL INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE: *Report on the Agrarian Reform*.
 ANSHEN RUTH: *Our Emergent Civilization*, 1947.
 APPLEBY P. H.: *Public Administration in India, Report of a Survey*, 1953.
 AZAD ABUL KALAM: *India Wins Freedom*, Bombay, 1959.
 AZAD ABUL KALAM: *Speeches of Maulana Azad, 1947-1955*, Calcutta. 1956.
- BAILY F. G.: *Caste and the Economic Frontier*.
 BALL W. M.: *Nationalism and Communism in East Asia*, 1952.
 BARAN PAUL: *The Political Economy of Growth*, 1958.
 BERNAL J. G.: *World Without War*, 1958.
 BERNAL J. G.: *Science in History*, 1957.
 BHAVE ACHARYA VINOBA: *Bhoodan to Gramdan*.
 BHAVE ACHARYA VINOBA: *The Principles and Philosophy of Bhoodan Yagna*.
 BHATTACHARYA DHIRESH: *India's Five Year Plans—An Economic Analysis*, 1957.
 BLACKETT P. M. S.: *Atomic Weapon and East West Relations*, 1956.
 BOONER A.: *Economic Planning and the Co-operative Movement*, 1950.
 BROOKINGS INSTITUTION: *Major Problems of United States Foreign Policy, 1950-51*.
 BUCHANAN NORMAN S. & ELLIS HOWARD S.: *Approaches to Economic Development*, 1955.
 BURNS W.: *Technological Possibilities of Agricultural Development in India*, 1944.
- CARSTAIRS G. MORRIS: *The Twice Born*.
 CENSUS OF INDIA: 1951.
 CHOUDHURI MANMOHAN: *The Gramdan Movement*.
 CLARK C. G.: *The Conditions of Economic Progress*, 1957.
 Conference on Cultural Freedom in Asia—Freedom and Economic Planning, 1955 (Proceedings).
 CONGRESS OF CULTURAL FREEDOM: *The Future of Freedom*, 1956.
 CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY DEBATES: Vol. 5.
- DANGE S. A.: *India from Primitive Communism to Slavery*.
 DAVIS KINGSLEY: *The Population of India and Pakistan*, 1951.
 DE CASTRO J.: *Geography of Hunger*, 1952.
 DESAI A. R.: *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, 1956.
 DESAI A. R.: *Rural Sociology in India*, 1959.
 DESAI M. B.: *Report on an Enquiry into the working of the Bombay Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act of 1948 in Gujarat*.
 DESAI NEERA A.: *Woman in Modern India*, 1957.
 DESHMUKH C. D.: *Economic Development in India*, 1957.

- DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (WEST BENGAL): *India's Villages (A collection of Articles originally published in 'Economic Weekly', Bombay).*
- DHILLON HARVANT: *Leadership and Groups in a South India Village.*
- DOBB MAURICE: *Some Aspects of Economic Development*, 1951.
- DOBB MAURICE: *Soviet Economic Development since 1917*, 1949. *
- DOBB MAURICE: *On Economic Theory and Socialism* 1955.
- DUBE S. C.: *Indian Village*, 1955.
- DUBE S. C.: *India's changing villages*, 1958.
- DUTT R. P.: *India Today and Tomorrow*, 1955.
- DUTT R. P.: *The Crisis of Britain and the British Empire*, 1953.
- DUTT R. P.: *India Today*, 1949.
- EMERSON RUPERT: *Representative Government in South East Asia*, 1955.
- F. A. O.: *State of Food and Agriculture 1953 to 1957.*
- F. A. O.: *Year Book of Food and Agriculture Statistics.*
- FEDERATION OF INDIAN CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRIES: *Second Five Year Plan*, 1955.
- FOURTH INTERNATIONAL: *The Death Agony of Capitalism.*
- FRYER PETER: *Hungarian Tragedy*, 1957.
- GADGIL D. R.: *Economic Policy and Development*, 1955.
- GADGIL & SOVANI: *War and Indian Economic Policy*, 1943.
- GHOSH ALAK: *New Horizon in Planning*, 1956.
- GHOSH BIMAL C.: *Planning For India*, 1944.
- GHURYE G. S.: *Caste and Class In India*, 1957.
- GHURYE: G. S.: *The Problem of the So-called Aborigines.*
- GORWALA A. D.: *Report on Public Administration*, 1951.
- GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
1. *Rural Manpower and Occupational Structure (Ministry of Labour)*
 2. *Report of the Agricultural Labour Enquiry (Office of Economic Advisers)*
 3. *Recent Economic and Social Trends in India, 1946 (Planning Commission)*
 4. *The First Five Year Plan*, 1952.
 5. *The Constituent Assembly Proceedings.*
 6. *The Constitution of India.*
 7. *States Reorganization Commission Report.*
 8. *Indian Labour Year Book (various years).*
 9. *Report of the Village Small Scale Industries Committee (Karve Committee).*
 10. *Indian Tax Reform—Report of a Survey by Nicholas Kaldor*, 1956.
 11. *Report of the Taxation Enquiry Commission.*
 12. *The Second Five Year Plan.*
 13. *Review of First Five Year Plan*, 1957.
 14. *Agricultural Legislation in India.*
 15. *Indian Year Books (various volumes).*
- GUPTA H. C.: *Problems and Process of Economic Planning in Underdeveloped Economics with Special Reference to India*, 1958.

GUTKIND E. A.: *Creative Demobilization* (2 Vols.) 'containing Principles of National Planning and Case studies in National Planning, 1948.

HANSON A. H. (Ed.): *Public Enterprise*, 1955.

HANSON A. H. (Ed.): *Public Enterprise and Economic Development*, 1959.

HARRIS SEYMORE E.: *Economic Planning*, 1949.

HAYEK F. A.: *Collectivist Economic Planning*, 1935.

HOUGH ELEANOR M.: *The Co-operative Movement in India*, 1959.

INDIAN SOCIETY OF AGRICULTURE ECONOMICS: *Seminar on Rational of Regional Variations in Agrarian Structure of India* (Proceedings).

JENNINGS: *Some Characteristics of Indian Constitution*.

KAHIN G. M.: *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*.

KAPADIA K. M.: *Marriage and Family in India*, 1955.

KHARE G. P.: *Planning in India*, 1958.

KOHN HANS: *Idea of Nationalism*, 1956.

KOSAMBI D. D.: *The Introduction to the Study of Indian History*, 1956.

KOSAMBI D. D.: *Exasperating Essays*.

KOZLOV V.: *Bourgeois Nations and Socialist Nations*.

KUMMARAPPA J. C.: *Planning by the People for the People*, 1954.

LANGE O. & TAYLOR F. M.: *On the Economic Theory of Socialism*, 1938.

LAŠKI H. J.: *The State in Theory and Practice*, 1935.

LAVIS OSCAR: *Group Dynamics in a North Indian Village: A Study of Faction*.

LAVIS OSCAR: *Village Life in Northern India*.

LENIN: *Collected Works* (Vols. I and II.)

LEWIS ARTHUR: *The Theory of Economic Growth*, 1955.

LUMBY E. W. R.: *The Transfer of Power in India*, 1954.

MADAN B. (Ed.): *Economic Problems of Underdeveloped Countries in Asia*, 1953.

MAJUMDAR D. N. & OTHERS (Ed.): *Rural Profiles*.

MALAVIA H. D.: *Land Reforms in India*, 1955.

MALAVIA H. D.: *Village Panchayat in India*, 1956.

MANNHEIM KARL: *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning*, 1951.

MAO TSE TUNG: *Selected Works* (Vols. I to IV.)

MARRIOTT MCKIM (Ed.): *Village India*, 1955.

MATTHAI JOHN: *Village Government in British India*, 1915.

HAZLEWOOD A.: *The Economics of "Under developed Areas"*.

MEHTA ASOKA & PATWARDHAN A.: *The Communal Triangle in India*, Allahabad.

MEHTA ASOKA: *Report on Foodgrains Enquiry Committee*, Delhi, 1957.

MEHTA M. M.: *Structure of Indian Industries*, 1955.

MEHTA M. M.: *Combination Movement in India*, 1952.

MENON V. P.: *Transfer of Power in India*, 1957.

MENON V. P.: *Story of Integration of the Indian States*, Bombay, 1956.

MILLS C. W.: *The Power Elite*, 1956.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND^o AGRICULTURE: *Bibliography of Indian Agricultural Economics.*

- MITRA K. (Ed.): *Economic Freedom and Economic Planning.* ,
- MUKHERJEE RAMKRISHNA: *The Dynamics of a Rural Society*, 1957.
- MURPHY G. & L. B.: *In the Minds of Men*, 1953.
- MYERS, C. A.: *Industrial Relations in India*, 1958.
- NARAYAN J. P.: *Socialism to Sarvodaya*, Madras. 1956.
- NARMADESHWAR PRASAD: *The Myth of the Caste System* 1957.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Before and After Independence (1922-1950)* Delhi.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Bunch of Letters*, Bombay 1958.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Discovery of India*, Calcutta, 1946.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Nehru's Speeches (1942-53)*, Delhi, 1954.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Nehru's Speeches (Vol. 3)*, Delhi, 1958.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Planning and Development Speeches*. Delhi, 1956.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Youth's Burden*, Bombay, 1944.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Autobiography*.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *Unity of India*.
- NEHRU JAWAHARLAL: *On Co-operation*.
- NURKSE R.: *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries*, 1953
- NURULLAH SAYEED & NAIK J. P.: *History of Education in India*, 1943
- PANANDIKAR S. G.: *Economic Reconstruction in Yugoslavia*, 1946.
- PANIKKAR K. M.: *Hindu Society at Cross Roads*, 1955.
- PANIKKAR K. M.: *Asia and Western Dominance*, 1954.
- PARK L. & TINKAR I.: *Leadership and Political Institution in India*, 1959. *
- PATEL BABURAO: *Burning Words*, 1957.
- PATTABHI SITARAMMAYYA: *History of the Indian National Congress Vol. I-1935, Vol. II-1947.*
- PLANNING COMMISSION: *P. E. O. Publications—Evaluation Reports on Working of Community Projects.*
- PUBLICATIONS DIVISION: *Facts about India.*
- RADHAKRISHNAN S.: *Report of the University Education Commission*, 1949.
- RAJENDRA PRASAD: *India Divided*, 1946.
- RANDIVE B. T.: *India's Five Year Plan*, 1953.
- Report of the Famine Commission (Final Report)*, 1945.
- RESEARCH PROGRAMME COMMITTEE: *Planning Commission. Reports on the Research. Schemes sponsored by*
- RESERVE BANK OF INDIA: *Report on the Survey of India's Foreign Liabilities and Assets.*
- RESERVE BANK OF INDIA: *Land Mortgage Banks.*
- RESERVE BANK OF INDIA: *All India Rural Credit Survey, Vol. II—General Report.*
- RESERVE BANK OF INDIA: *Reports on Currency and Finance.*
- ROYAL INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS: *A Food Plan for India.*
- SAXENA: *Second Five Year Plan*, 1957.
- SEN AMAR: *On Monopoly* 1957.
- SHAH C. G.: *Sampatti Daan and Bhoodan Movement*

- SHUKLA CHANDRAVADAN: *Socialistic Pattern*, 1955.
- SOROKIN P. A.: *Social Philosophies of an Age of Crisis*, 1952.
- SOVANI: *Planning of Post-War Economic Development in India*, 1951.
- SPATE O. H. K.: *India and Pakistan*, 1954.
- SUBBA RAO B.: *The Personality of India*, 1958.
- TALBOT PHILLIPS: *South Asia in the World Today*, 1950.
- TAYLOR C.: *A Critical Analysis of India's Community-Development Programme*.
- TENDULKAR D. G.: *Mahatma*, Vols. 1-8.
- THAPER R.: *India in Transition*, 1956.
- THAYER P. W. (Ed.): *Nationalism and Progress in Free India*, 1956.
- THIRUMALAI S.: *Post-war Agricultural Problems and Policies in India*, 1954.
- THORNER D.: *Agrarian Prospects in India*, 1956.
- Transactions of the Third World Congress of Sociology.*
- U. N. O.: *Demographic Year Book*, 1957.
- U. N. O.: *Economic Applications of Atomic Energy*, 1957
- U. N. O.: *Economic Developments in Africa*, 1957.
- U. N. O.: *Economic Developments in Middle East*.
- U. N. O.: *Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East Problems and Techniques*.
1955 Year Books.
- U. N. O.: *Measures of the Economic Development of Undeveloped Countries*.
- U. N. O.: *World Economic Survey Yearly Reports. Processes and Problems of
Industrialization in Underdeveloped Countries*, 1955
- U. N. O.: *Land Reforms Defects in Agrarian Structure*.
- U. N. O.: *Taxes and Fiscal Policy in Underdeveloped Countries*, 1954.
- U. N. O.: *Public Finance—Surveys. India*, (Department of Economic Affairs).
1951
- UNITED STATES SUB-COMMITTEE ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME: *Economic Development in India and Communist China*, 1956.
- UNNITHAN T. K. A.: *Gandhi and Free India* 1956.
- VAKIL C. N.: *Economic Consequences of Divided India*, 1950.
- VAKIL C. N. & BRAHMANAND P. R.: *Planning for an Expanded Economy*, 1956
- VEBLIN: *The Theory of Leisure Class*, 1949.
- VENKAT SUBBIAH: *Indian Economy since Independence*. 1958
- WADIA P. A. & MERCHANT K. T.: *Our Economic Problem*, 1954.
- WADIA P. A. & MERCHANT K. T.: *Bombay Plan—A Criticism*.
- WADIA P. A. & MERCHANT K. T.: *The Five Year Plan—A Criticism*, 1951.
- WOOTTON BARBARA: *Freedom under Planning*, 1945.
- ZINKIN MAURICE: *Development for Free India*, 1956.
- ZINKIN MAURICE: *Problems of Economic Development in India*, 1954.

P E R I O D I C A L S

A.I.C.C. Economic Review.
American Journal of Sociology.
American Sociological Review.
Annals.
American Anthropologists.
Call.
Capital.
Commerce.
Current Sociology.
Eastern Anthropologists.
Economic Weekly.
Foreign Affairs.
Fourth International.
Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics
Janata.
Kurukshetra.
Mankind.
Man in India.
Modern Review.
Monthly Review.
New Age.
Pacific Affairs.
Rural India.
Rural Sociology.
Sociological Bulletin.

INDEX

- Acharya Vinoba Bhave, 71
 Afro-Asian Bloc, 22-23
 Agrarian Policy of Congress Government, 89-96; alarming trends as a result of, 95; chief measures of, 90; impact of, 93, 94, 96; new patterns of tensions as a result of, 95-96; new Rural Elite as a result of, 126-128; repercussions of, 91; social trends generated as a result of, 125-130; villages, a battle field of competing groups as a result of, 125
 Agrarian Reforms by Congress Government, 89-96; advantages taken by substantial farmers, 93-94; capitalist postulates of, 93-94; critique of, 92; Gadgil on the 'core' of, 91; its impact on institutional life, 94-95; its impact on various strata, 96; their premises, 90-91
 Albania, 6
 Algeria, 11, 72
 American Imperialism, 00; a guardian of world capitalism, 8-9; its three principal reasons for giving Aid, 8-9
 Atlantic Charter, 35
 August Resolution of 1942, 37-38: D. D. Kosambi on, 37-38
 August Struggle, 39
 Axis Powers, 2, 3, 26, 35, 36
 Azad, Maulana, 41, 50
 "Back to Vedic and Gita Approach", 134
 Bagdad Pact, 22, 23
 Bandung Conference, 22, 23
 Bose, Subhas, 39
 Bourgeoisie, Indian: classic opportunity for, 28; its reckless profiteering during war-period, 31, 32; takes advantage of, War situation, 27, 28
 Britain, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 26, 38; its weakened position after World War Second, 9, 10, 11
 British Commonwealth, The, 22, 23
 British Government rejects Congress proposal, 34
 British Imperialism, 26
 Bulgaria, 6
 Burma, 6, 12, 15, 39
 Cabinet Mission, 40, 42, 43
 Cambodia, 6
 Capital, Indian, new Era of Fusion with Foreign Capital, 32, 33
 Caste, 13, 53, 57, 87, 91, 96, 103, 114, 117, 119, 121, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 133, 137
 Ceylon, 6, 12
 China, 5, 7, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19; its peculiar position in Socialist Bloc, 18, 19; its Unique features after Revolution, 18, 19
 Colonial People's; war of, 5
 Colonial World: countries of the, 12; during post-war period, 12-16
 Communalism, 36
 Communist Parties, their function outside the Socialist countries, 19, 20
 Communist Party of India, 27, 137; its Policy during World War Second, 27; its Zigzags, 137
 Community Development Programmes, 94; its evaluation, 95
 Congress Socialist Party, the, 27
 Constitution of Indian Union, 56, 70, 76; bourgeois character of, 57, 58; central principle of, 104, 105; its Socio-Cultural significance, 102, 103; main provisions of, 57, 60; practical problems raised by, 104-105; weaknesses of, 71
 Constituent Assembly, 62, 63
 Contemporary World Scene; major

- contradictions in, 20-21
 Cripps' Mission, 35
 Cultural Configurations in urban areas, lower class, 122; upper class, 121-22
 Czecho-slovakia, 6
 Desai Morarji, 89, 100
 East Europe, 5, 6, 7
 East European Countries, 16; Gadgil's observations on, 16, 17
 Eastern Group Supply Council, 30
 Economic policy of the Congress Government, 96-102; Ball's observations on, 101-102; double-drain as a result of the special, 97; growing inequality as a result of, 102; its postulates of Mixed Economy, 97; major contradictions in, 96-99; paradoxical position with regard to augmenting of resources as a result of, 98; sharp controversy among two wings of bourgeoisie regarding, 100-101; two problems as a result of the postulates of, 97
 Economic oligarchs and nepotism, 86-87
 Economic Rulers of Indian people, 85-86
 Education, 107-115; absence of planned drive to create literature in Indian languages for, 110, 111; absence of rational Plan in, 109-110; bizzare state of affairs in, 112; Cinderalla, 110; Congress government's approach towards, 108, 109; dilemma in the field of, 111-12; growing appetite for, 112-113; major defects during British Rule, 107-108; Pragmatic and contradictory policies: with regard to, 114-115; sorry state of, 113-114; unresolved problem of media of instruction at various levels in, 110-111
Egypt, 12, 22
 Equality and Acquisitive Society, 105
 Feudal States, 64, 65, 66; reasons for the success of their absorption, 65-66; strategy of their absorption, 65; undesirable features of the Congress approach, 66
 Five Year Plans: assists Indian Capitalists, 83-85; capitalist character of, 81; precursors of, 80, 81
 Foreign Capital, and Foreign Policy, 100-101; Baran on the role of, 100; desperate hunt for, 99-101
 Foreign Pockets, 64, 69, 70
 Foreign Policy of the Government of Indian Union, 71-73
 Forum of Free Enterprise, 100
 France, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 62
 Future Perspective, 23-24
 Gandhian Doctrine of Trusteeship, 76
 Germany, 35, 62; disarmament of, 7; Nazi, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 16, 27
 Hindu Mahasabha, 43
 Hungarian Revolution, 18, 72
 Hungary, 6
 Idealist and Religio Revivalist Trends after Independence, 132-134; some manifestations, of, 132-134
 Imperialist Powers, strategy of, 11
 Imperialist States, fundamental Antagonisms between Fascists & Democratic Groups of, 3
 Indian Bourgeoisie, 51-53; conflicting views about Indian Development, 88-89; its historic position, basic limitations, strategy and policies, 51-54
 Indian National Army, 39
 Indian National Congress, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104; acceptance of mix-economy by, 79; and *British Government*, 34-45; class character of, 26, 27,

- 54, 55, 56; economic problems after coming to power of, 73; growing rift with Muslim League, 43; its acceptance of Partition, 48; its changed characterization of War, 35; its classic strategy, 26-27; its evaluation of war as Imperialist, 34; its major postulates in shaping Indian life, 54, 55, 56, 58, 63, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70, 73, 76; its notion of Indian Nation, 48; major alternatives before, 73-75; party of unity, vivisection India, 47-48; some crucial questions emerging for historians by its acceptance of Partition, 48-50
- Individual Civil Disobedience, 34, 35
- Indonesia, 6, 15
- Industrial Policy of Congress Government, 82-83; Professor Hanson on, 000
- Industrial Policy Resolutions, 77, 81;
- Industrialization: bourgeois versus socialist, 115-116; character of mobility in India under Capitalist, 123; comparison between, in Western countries and India, 118, Congress Government chooses Capitalist, 117; features of Capitalist, 117; impact on Family, Morality, Crime and Prostitution in India, of Capitalist, 122-123; its Social Implications in Urban Areas, 120-21; limitations of Bourgeois, 118-119; peculiar contradictory phenomenon emerging in backward countries as a result of Capitalist, 119-120; social Trends generated as a result of Capitalist, 117-124; two patterns of Social Relations as a result of two modes of, 115, 116, 117
- Industries, Indian, Eastern Economist on its Growth, 29, 30; its Growth during War Period, 28-30; *statistics of its growth during War Period, 29*
- Inter-Imperialist Conflicts after World War II, 10, 11
- International Alliances & Organisation: their limitations & Role, 21-23
- Iraq, 22
- Israel, 22
- Italy, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 62
- Japan, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 35, 38
- Jayaprakash Narayan, 39, 71
- Kashmir, 43, 46
- Korea, 12, 22
- Ladakh, 22
- Land Reforms, 91; critique of, 92; major defects of, 92, 93; Thorner on, 92
- Laos, 6
- Laski, H. J., 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 70
- Lohia, Ram Manohar, 50
- Maha Gujarat Movement, 68
- Mahatma Gandhi, 37, 38, 41, 44, 132
- Marshall Plan, 8
- Mixed Economy, 77
- Mountbatten Plan, 44, 45; reasons for its acceptance, 45
- Muslim League, 27, 28, 34, 36, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 49, 54; defines its goal, 27; its class character, 27; its strategy, 27
- N.A.T.O., 22, 23
- Nations of Africa, 6
- National Consciousness of Indian People, 39
- National Emancipation, Wars of, 5
- Nationalism, its main features, 51; Rosa-Luxemburg on, 51
- Nationalism, Indian, 1; basic Democratic Tasks, 1, 2; economic developments during war period, 28-33; history of, 2; political developments during War period, 33-46; weakened by Communalism, 36
- Nationalist Movement; its basic weakness, 36
- Nationalities, 64, 66, 67; and Linguistic States, 66-69; empirical ap-

- proach of Congress Government, 68; problem in Indian Union, 66, 67, 69
- Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal, 44, 51, 72, 73, 77, 80, 89, 100, 101, 105
- New Independent Countries, 12, 13, 14; main features of the economic policies of ruling classes of, 13, 14; problem before ruling classes of, 12-14; trends of development after Independence, 13-14
- Non-Party Democracy, 71
- Pakistan, 6, 12, 15, 22, 42, 45, 46, 49, 54, 72
- Panchshila, 69, 72, 73
- Partition of India, 52; implications of, 45-46; Mahatma Gandhi's acceptance of, 45; National Congress, Reasons for acceptance of, 44-45; Pandit Nehru on acceptance of, 44; some crucial questions, 48-50; stormy controversy about, 48-50
- Pearl Harbour, 35
- Planning, two conceptions of, 77-78
- Plans in India, democratic, 98
- Poland, 6
- Political Parties in India, 134-36
- Political Tasks after Independence, 64
- Portuguese Pockets, 69, 70
- Poznan Revolt, 18
- Praja-Socialist Party, 134-35; its history, 135; its ideology, 135; its present situation, 135
- Private Sector, Myers on, 87-88
- Public Sector, and Capitalism, 78; matter of necessity for Capitalist Class, 78-79; reasons for its adoption, 79
- R.I.N. Mutiny, 40, 45, 49
- Radical Humanism, 134
- Raj Gopalachari, 89, 132
- Rajendra Prasad, 132
- Refugee Problem, 46
- Roy, M. N., 134
- Rumania, 6
- S.E.A.T.O., 22, 23
- Samyukta Maharashtra Movement, 68
- Secular Civil Code, Reasons for its non-elaboration in Indian Union, 106-107
- Second Five Year Plan, 77
- Socialist Bloc, deformities in, 17; emergence of, 7, 16; features of, 16; future trends in, 19; major contradictions within the, 17, 18; major tensions within, 17, 18; significance of, 16-17
- Socialist Party, 136
- Soviet Union, 2, 4, 7, 9, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 27, 35, 72
- Spain, 62
- State, need for emphasising class character of, 57-60
- State, of Indian Union: a bourgeois welfare state, 56-63; its trends of Development, 70
- State, Welfare: actual functioning of, 62, 63; its features, 60, 61, 62, 63; Laski on, 61, 62
- Suez Question, 10
- Swatantra Party, 136
- Tibet, 72, 75
- Transfer of Power, 55; a Constitutional Device, 55, 56; G. L. Mehta on, 56; its implications, 55, 56; two power blocs, 14
- U.N.O., the, 9, 10, 21, 22, 46; its major defects, 21, 22; its role, 21-22
- U.S.A., the, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 20, 35, 63, 89, 100, 101
- U.S.S.R., 100, 101
- Underdeveloped countries, economic tasks confronting, 74-75; nature of Functioning of capitalist state in, 15; some Crucial Questions with regard to economic development of, 74, 75; trends of development in, 14, 15; two-fold evils in, 53
- Vallabhbhai Patel, Sardar, 40, 41, 65

Viet Nam, 6, 12, 22

War Advisory Council, 34

War Aim, 3

Warsaw Pact, 22, 23

World War I, 5, 7

World War Second, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,
7, 14, 19, 26, 27, 33, 47, 48

